



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

877,564



M



M



M



M



M



M



M



M



•

THE  
ANNUAL REGISTER.  
1886.

THE  
ANNUAL REGISTER:

A  
REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME  
AND ABROAD,

FOR THE YEAR

1886.

NEW SERIES.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

LONGMANS & CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.; HAMILTON & CO.;  
HOULSTON & SONS; SMITH, ELDER, & CO.; E. BUMPUS;  
H. SOTHERAN & CO.; BICKERS & SON; J. TOOVEY;  
J. WHELDON; R. WASHBOURNE.

1887.



✓  
2  
A62

PRINTED BY  
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET 84  
LONDON

CHIGAN

THE UN

CHIGAN

1

# CONTENTS.

## PART I.

### ENGLISH HISTORY.

#### CHAPTER I.

The Position of Parties—Opinions on the Irish Question : Sir James St. John, Mr. Lecky, Mr. Giffen, &c.—Mr. Childers's Candidature at Edinburgh—John Morley at Chelmsford—The *Fortnightly Review* Article—The Opening of Parliament—Election of the Speaker—Mr. Bradlaugh's Oath—Resignation of Lord Carnarvon—The Belfast Deputation to Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone—The Queen's Speech—Debate on the Address—Mr. Gladstone's Speech—Mr. Parnell's Speeches—The New Rules of Procedure—Mr. Hunter's Motion—Mr. Barclay's Amendments—Mr. Jesse Collings's Resolution—Speeches by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, and Mr. Goschen—Defeat of the Government—Resignation of the Cabinet . . . . . 1

#### CHAPTER II.

Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet—Mr. John Morley made Secretary for Ireland—Attitude of the Whigs—Apportionment of Offices—Mr. Chamberlain's Resignation—Office—Mr. Morley at Newcastle—The London Riots—Lord R. Churchill's Speech—Lord Salisbury on the Conservative Policy—Lord Hartington at the Carlton Club—Resolution in the House of Commons to Abolish the House of Lords—Motion to Disestablish the Church in Wales and Scotland—The Railway Traffic Bill—The Estimates—The Budget—The Crofters' Bill—Foreign Affairs . . . . . 2

#### CHAPTER III.

The Government of Ireland Bill—First Rumour as to its Nature—The Schism in the Liberal Party—The Attitude of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan—Their Resignation—Mr. Caine's Election at Barrow—Death of Mr. Forster—Mr. Gladstone's Bill—His Speech—Mr. Chamberlain's and Mr. Trevelyan's Explanations—Debate—Speeches by Mr. Parnell, Lord Hartington, Mr. J. Morley, Mr. Goschen—The Bill read a First Time—Opinions of the Opposition—The Meeting at the Opera House—Ipswich Election—The Irish Land Bill—Sir James Caird's Views—Lord Monteagle's—The Land Purchase Bill introduced—Mr. Gladstone's Speech—Mr. Chamberlain's and Mr. Parnell's Criticisms—Public Opinion . . . . . 3

#### CHAPTER IV.

The Position of Parties—Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen—The Disunion of the Whigs and Mr. Gladstone—Earl Spencer's Speech at Newcastle-on-Tyne—John Morley's Re-election Opposed—Lord Hartington and his Constituents—Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham—Mr. Gladstone's Letter to the Electors of Midlothian—Mr. Goschen's Campaign—The Second Reading of the Government Bill—Protracted Debate—Defeat of the Government—Legislation of the Session—Prorogation and Dissolution of Parliament . . . . . 4

## CHAPTER V.

The General Election—The Liberal Unionists—Mr. Gladstone's Address—Election Speeches and Manifestoes—Mr. Gladstone in Scotland—Lord Salisbury at Leeds—Mr. Morley and his Constituents—Mr. Gladstone at Manchester and Liverpool—Mr. John Bright's Speech to his Electors—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Balfour—The Elections—Liberal Losses in the Boroughs—Successes in the North—The County Contests—General Results—Mr. Gladstone Resigns—Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington—The New Ministry—Parliament Reassembles—Election of Speaker—Ministers at the Mansion House . . . . . page [223

## CHAPTER VI.

Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet—The Estimates—The Tenants' Relief Bill—Prorogation of Parliament—Lord R. Churchill at Dartford and Bradford—The Liberal Associations—Lord Salisbury at the Guildhall—Foreign Politics—Mr. John Morley in Scotland—The Unionist Liberals—Lord R. Churchill's Resignation—Disintegration of Parties . [261

## CHAPTER VII.

## IRELAND.

Lord Carnarvon's Retirement—The Galway Election—The Belfast Riots—The General Election—The Plan of Campaign—Its Consequences . . . [305

## FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

## CHAPTER I.

FRANCE AND ITALY . . . . . [317

## CHAPTER II.

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY . . . . . [343

## CHAPTER III.

EASTERN EUROPE: RUSSIA—TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE . . . . . [365

## CHAPTER IV.

MINOR STATES OF EUROPE: BELGIUM—THE NETHERLANDS—SWITZERLAND—SPAIN—PORTUGAL—DENMARK—NORWAY—SWEDEN . . . . . [382

## CHAPTER V.

ASIA: INDIA—CENTRAL ASIA AND AFGHANISTAN—CHINA AND JAPAN . . . [413

## CHAPTER VI.

AFRICA: EGYPT—SOUTH AFRICA—THE CONGO—MADAGASCAR . . . . 446

CHAPTER VII.

AMERICA : UNITED STATES—CANADA—MEXICO—CENTRAL AMERICA—WEST INDIES -- BRAZIL—CHILI AND PERU . . . . .	page [466
---	-----------

CHAPTER VIII.

ATLANTIC OCEAN . . . . .	[490
--------------------------	------

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF EVENTS . . . . .	1
PERSPECTIVE OF LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART . . . . .	62
PORTRAIT OF EMINENT PERSONS . . . . .	124
INDEX . . . . .	177





# ANNUAL REGISTER

FOR THE YEAR

1886.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

The Position of Parties—Opinions on the Irish Question: Sir James Stephen, Mr. Lecky, Mr. Giffen, &c.—Mr. Childers's Candidature at Edinburgh—Mr. John Morley at Chelmsford—The *Fortnightly Review* Article—The Opening of Parliament—Election of the Speaker—Mr. Bradlaugh's Oath—Resignation of Lord Carnarvon—The Belfast Deputation to Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone—The Queen's Speech—Debate on the Address—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell's Speeches—The new Rules of Procedure—Mr. Hunter's and Mr. Barclay's Amendments—Mr. Jesse Collings's Resolution—Speeches by Mr. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, and Mr. Goschen—Defeat of the Government—Resignation of the Cabinet.

IN spite of the annexation of the kingdom of Ava to our already vast Indian Empire, home politics alone occupied public attention when the year opened. The inconclusive result of the general election was interpreted still more unfavourably by the light of the manifesto attributed to Mr. Gladstone, and never completely disavowed by him. The hopes which at one moment had been raised that the chiefs of the two great parties in the country would concur upon some scheme for the pacification of Ireland faded away as the meeting of Parliament drew near, whilst among the leaders of the Liberal party themselves no sign appeared that they appreciated the imminence of a crisis, or that they were agreed upon a line of action should a vote of the House of Commons suddenly call them to office.

Lord Salisbury, although retaining office for the moment, could only reckon upon the support of 249 votes out of a total of 670, and it was therefore obvious that, unless he could form some combination with a section of his opponents, he must give place

to Mr. Gladstone, or offer such terms to Mr. Parnell as would ensure the support of the Irish Nationalists. But, even if any such thought ever crossed his mind, it seemed that in such overtures he had been forestalled; and the rumour of Mr. Gladstone's readiness to offer a large measure of Home Rule had already produced symptoms of a breach in the Liberal party. Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen were credited with a determination to give no countenance to any proposal which, either directly or by implication, conceded the principle of Home Rule, and the advanced Radicals under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain, although threatening to create a schism on the question of the reform of the Land Laws and of the system of county government, earnestly repudiated any measure which pointed towards a repeal of the Union.

It must, however, be added that the gravity of the crisis had not escaped Mr. Gladstone; for he made no secret of his readiness to meet Lord Salisbury for the discussion of a wide scheme of government for Ireland. Had the Conservative Minister seen his way to accept these overtures, it was argued that, on the one hand, the Liberals would be in a position to impose terms upon the Irish Nationalists, and the Conservatives would have no reason to fear the defection or opposition of the Ulster Orangemen. But this idea, or some modification of it, although supported in the Cabinet, as was asserted, by Lord Carnarvon (the Irish Viceroy) and by Lord Randolph Churchill, and not unfavourably regarded by Lord Salisbury himself, failed to commend itself to the majority of that body, and the opportunity of dealing with Irish Home Rule on the plan adopted for the settlement of the Franchise Bill passed away.

Meanwhile the public, if perplexed by a multitude of counsellors, was provided with abundant opportunities of estimating the difficulties which beset the Irish question and the hindrances to its solution. Sir James Stephen, the distinguished judge and jurist, in two noteworthy letters to the *Times* (Jan. 4 and 5) gave his views at length on Home Rule, which during the previous eleven years he had studied in Ireland itself. The result of his reflections and observation was that, although five alternative courses were open to English statesmen, one only, that of firm maintenance of the law, offered any prospect of being a permanent solution of the difficulty. The establishment of Ireland as an absolutely independent State would make all Irishmen foreigners both in Great Britain and her colonies, deprive the United Kingdom of some of its most distinguished statesmen, generals, and judges, and by a formidable depletion of the ranks of the army render conscription for England and Scotland imperative. There would, moreover, be living in our midst numerous foreigners who, through their Minister in London, might continually harass the Ministry of the day, and often thwart its policy. Sir J. Stephen argued that *the guarantees* by which some pretended to distinguish Home

Rule from complete separation were, in fact, illusory, and that at any time an Irish Parliament might declare itself independent. In the suggested establishment of local government other than, and not called, a Parliament, he saw only a weaker form of a Home Rule Parliament, and practically leading up to it. The renewal of so much of the Crimes Act as experience had shown to be indispensable to life and property might, he admitted, lead to a conflict between the upholders of the law and the National League; he nevertheless regarded even a civil war as a smaller calamity than the dismemberment of the Empire. Sir James Stephen endorsed Mr. Trevelyan's new expression, at Stratford-on-Avon, that there was no halfway house between entire separation and absolute Imperial control. Earl Grey followed (Jan. 6) in much the same strain; but he refused to allow that the grant of increased powers of local government to Scotland was any reason for extending it to Ireland in its existing condition. Although he would regret to see the re-enactment of the Coercion Acts without careful inquiry, he thought it would be the greatest of all errors to shrink from resorting to such provisions of the former Acts as could be shown to be necessary or efficacious to assert the supremacy of the law.

Mr. W. E. H. Lecky, the distinguished historian, and himself an Irishman, expressed himself (Jan. 13) more strongly, and without that sense of responsibility which modified the views of the jurist and the statesman. "The essential fact of the Irish question is that the party which has won eighty-five seats in the present representation of Ireland is a party which is animated by two leading ideas—a desire to plunder the whole landed property of the country, and an inveterate hatred of the English connection in every form. . . . Within narrow limits changes in local government may be improvements, but the proposed bodies will not conciliate the disloyal. They will increase their power, and they are more likely to lower than to raise the standard of administration. . . . What is now wanted for Ireland is not an extension of local government, but a restoration of the liberty of the people, of that first and most fundamental condition of liberty, a state of society in which men may pursue their lawful business and fulfil their lawful contracts without danger or molestation."

Moreover, Mr. Childers, an ex-colleague of Mr. Gladstone, speaking (Jan. 6) in support of his candidature at Edinburgh, advanced but little beyond these safe doctrines. "Nothing," he said, "would induce me to consent to anything which might be called the repeal of the Union; nothing which would imply, directly or indirectly, a separation between Great Britain and Ireland, or would interfere with the unity of the Empire and the power of Parliament—the power, influence, and authority of Parliament, which, to my mind, are the greatest security for our Empire." Mr. Childers thought that it would not be difficult to *distinguish between matters of an imperial character and those*

of local importance. Amongst the former he placed everything connected with the Crown and Civil List, with the Colonies, India, foreign affairs, the armed forces of the Crown—army, navy, and militia—our flag and maritime jurisdiction, the Customs, Excise, Post Office, and telegraphs, the High Court of Appeal, matters relating to the coinage, currency, and National Debt, &c. On the other hand, he regarded “the ordinary administration of justice, the public establishments, the civilian police, public works and buildings, education, the Poor Law, &c.,” as matters which might be fairly left “to bodies locally elected.” Mr. Childers, in reply to certain strictures to which his speeches at Pontefract had given rise, declared that to hand over the control of the Irish constabulary to any local authority, and to remove it from the control of the Imperial Government and Parliament, never had been and never could be a proposal from him. On the question of the constitution of the local authority he was less explicit, and his declarations on this point seemed at one time to compromise his candidature for the capital of Midlothian. “I do not think,” he said, “that any one who is not actually a Minister can safely or properly distinguish what those local bodies ought to be. How far any county authority, how far any provincial authority, how far any central authority should be concerned in these branches of administration I decline absolutely to say. What I do say is this, that everything which is not strictly local must be retained for the Imperial Parliament and the Imperial Government, for there cannot be two parliaments in this country.” Mr. Childers’s views on the Irish question seemed so unsatisfactory to the more advanced section of the electors, that efforts were made to persuade some more fervent Radical to contest the seat. Overtures were addressed to Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and others, but without success, they deeming it undesirable to divide the Liberal interest. Mr. Childers was consequently accepted as the party candidate, and, although throughout his canvass he maintained an opportunist attitude on the Irish question, he was eventually elected, but was not able to take his seat until after the actual business of the session had commenced and the critical division had been taken.

From these and many similar speeches, however, it was evident that the amount of self-government to be accorded to Ireland by Liberals or Conservatives was one of degree rather than of essence. These opinions and hopes were further reduced to a more practical form by a writer in the *Statist* newspaper (Jan. 9), who showed how the one great obstacle in the way of any Home Rule scheme, the security of the property of the landlords, might be effected without imposing any serious burden on the Imperial Exchequer. His plan briefly was as follows: (1) to buy out every landlord in Ireland, giving him consols at par *equal to twenty years’* purchase of the judicial rents; (2) to give

land rent free to the present occupiers, subject only to a rent-charge equal to one-half or two-thirds of the existing rent, and payable to the new local Irish authorities ; and (3) to relieve the Imperial Exchequer of all charges borne on it in connection with the local government of Ireland. This cost for law, police, prisons, education, and the like, amounting to about four millions annually, would, it was calculated, almost balance the interest on 160,000,000*l.*, which, taking the rental of Ireland at eight millions, would represent twenty years' purchase of the annual value. In case, however, of the sum required for interest exceeding the amount of the charges from which the Imperial Budget would be relieved, the local authorities in Ireland would be empowered to pay out of the rent-charge collected by them any sum needed to make up the difference. The author of this proposal suggested, moreover, that a sliding scale of rents, varying the rent-charge according to the average prices of agricultural produce, might be advantageously adopted ; that the new local authorities might have control of their own police ; that in the event of any central council for the management of Irish affairs Ulster should have a council of its own ; and that the representation of Ireland at Westminster should be reduced to about thirty-five members, that being about the proportion to the total of 670 which the Irish contribution would bear to the whole Imperial revenues.

A totally fresh departure for discussion was, however, given by Mr. John Morley, M.P., in a speech at Chelmsford (Jan. 7), at a banquet in celebration of the Liberal successes in Essex. Radiating at the outset of his remarks the theory put forward by many Liberal members that they had received no mandate at the last election to deal with the Irish question, he declared that they all had a mandate to use their minds and judgments to the best of their ability in meeting circumstances as they arose, applying their Liberal principles with all their sense and courage and conscience. "Liberalism," he continued, "would be all unworthy of its great traditions and muscular vigour in dealing with difficult questions if it had nothing to say when a crisis such as this arose, requiring all the resources of constructive statesmanship to deal with it, and making such demands on our national fortitude and national enterprise. The country and circumstances will acquit or condemn. The beginning, no doubt, of any approach to a satisfactory settlement of Ireland must be some dealing with the land question. The late Government, to their great honour, passed an Act to prevent landlords confiscating the property of their tenants. I do not think we shall be able to deal satisfactorily with Ireland until we have passed some legislation to prevent tenants confiscating the property of their landlords." Mr. Morley then went on to say that he anticipated but little relief to the Parliamentary burden from any change in the rules of procedure. Order in Ireland and power



in the House of Commons at Westminster could only be obtained by the removal of the Irish members. It was they who were able to weaken our policy, to overturn Ministries, and to reject bills from motives which were not in our sense national and patriotic. He next criticised Mr. Justice Stephen's proposals, which, as he said, might be resumed in an appeal to revive the Crimes Act; although during the time it was in force boycotting, intimidation, and the "Murder Club" flourished. He ridiculed, moreover, the Tory expedients of local government in Ireland, declaring that in his opinion they would merely aggravate the existing difficulties, whilst in a larger assembly with important functions and a sense of responsibility the landlords and minorities would have a far better chance of making themselves felt. In conclusion, Mr. Morley expressed his belief that in so great a national crisis there was no one competent to develop a scheme for the government of Ireland except Mr. Gladstone, who had devoted the best years of his life to the amelioration of the condition of that country.

Mr. Morley's speech, it was generally recognised, placed the solution of the Irish question as the first duty of the Liberal party. At the general election it had been either ignored or alluded to in vague terms. The rival sections of the party, headed respectively by Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, had respectively insisted upon the urgency of a reform of the Land Laws, or the "nationalisation" of the land; and a schism had manifested itself, which only Mr. Gladstone's tact and influence had prevented becoming dangerous. The intention of the Liberal leaders possibly had been to allow the Government to state its intentions with regard to Ireland, or, in the event of its decision to do nothing, to await the unfolding of Mr. Parnell's demands before deciding upon their line of action. Mr. John Morley's speech, however, rendered the prolonged maintenance of an expectant attitude impossible. He showed clearly that amongst the Radical party there were men prepared to yield a very considerable portion of Home Rule in answer to the Irish demand, as expressed by the elections. The fear lest such an attitude might provoke further differences of opinion amongst the Liberal party was a matter with which Mr. Morley in his independent position had no concern, and, although his speech called forth much adverse criticism from various quarters, it at the same time evoked enough approval to show that he spoke the minds of a large section of his party. To Mr. Chamberlain, however, the views advocated were clearly unacceptable. Although, in speaking a few days later (Jan. 11) at the Westminster Palace Hotel, he confined his remarks to the condition of the agricultural labourer and the question of small allotments, an anonymous article, signed "A Radical," appeared in the *Fortnightly Review* (Feb. 11). In this article, which was attributed to Mr. Chamberlain by Sir W. Harcourt, in

spite of its denial by Mr. Chamberlain (April 13), he charged Mr. Gladstone with having precipitated the crisis by the premature publication of certain proposals with which his name had, rightly or wrongly, been connected. These proposals, throwing over altogether the idea of subordinate local and national authorities, contemplated the creation of what would, in the writer's opinion, be practically an independent parliament in Dublin. "Such a parliament, once created, would devote itself in the first instance to getting rid of its artificial limitations, and in a very few years it would be in fact, as well as in name, entirely independent. All questions affecting religion, education, the ownership of land, and taxation would be determined solely and entirely by the Irish Parliament according to the wishes and prejudices of its constituents." If, in addition, the Irish members were to retain their representation in the Imperial Parliament, the position of the English would be most anomalous. It might have a majority in the British Parliament, and yet be in a minority in the Imperial Legislature. If in such a case it continued to hold office its responsibility to Parliament would be a divided allegiance. "A Radical" then examined the other proposals which had been put forward—that of placing Ireland on the same footing as Canada and other self-governing colonies; that of making her completely independent, the sole connection being the right of Great Britain to garrison Ireland, and the privilege of paying the troops employed for that purpose; and, finally, the establishment of a Federal Government after the model of the United States. According to this scheme, Ireland might have one, or even two, local legislatures, if Ulster preferred to retain a separate independence. Scotland and Wales would each have another—in other words, six separate legislatures would be coexistent, each with its own ministry, and over all an Imperial Parliament charged with the control of foreign and colonial affairs, military and naval expenditure, the Customs, Post Office, &c. Admitting that such a scheme might work without friction, and would not be seriously objected to by consistent Radicals, "A Radical" held it to be hardly conceivable that the people of Great Britain as a whole were prepared for such a violent and complete revolution. The only remaining alternative, that of complete separation, the writer thought unnecessary to discuss. Ireland, he thought, would probably be a hostile country, would almost certainly institute conscription, and would find little difficulty in raising an army of 150,000 good soldiers, and thus become a constant and serious danger to Great Britain. His own policy and the remedies he suggested were alike based upon patience and expectancy. He thought Mr. Parnell had reached the height of his power, which was founded upon somewhat shifting conditions—the contributions from America, the maintenance of his own unchallenged supremacy, and the indirect support of certain *English Liberals*. Assuming, however, that "something

must be done," the writer demurred to the truth of the assertion that the only choice left lay between the concession of Home Rule and the most stringent coercion. He regarded the dangers arising from a renewal of Fenian outrages as greatly exaggerated; and with regard to Parliamentary obstruction, although eighty-five members might make the transaction of all business impossible without offending any rule of the House, he believed that power to defend themselves would rest with the majority of the House of Commons, and that, either by inviting the Speaker to assume a dictatorship or by temporarily excluding the Irish members, the complete breakdown of Parliamentary government might be averted. The remedies which "A Radical" proposed started with a fresh consideration of the Irish Land question in frank concert with the Nationalist party; Mr. Parnell should be challenged to take the burden and responsibility of office, and on his refusal the offer should be made to Mr. Healy; and the demand for Home Rule should stand over until the more urgent question which lay at the root of Irish misery and Irish discontent—the Land question—had been decided. He was prepared to adopt some modification of the scheme published in the *Statist* newspaper (and attributed to Mr. Giffen), although he considered the payments to existing landlords too liberal; and he concluded with the expression of his conviction that some "immense operation in the way of land purchase, and of the municipalisation of the land of Ireland by its transfer to the local authorities," would not be lightly rejected by the 600,000 cultivating tenants who would benefit by its adoption.

Although this programme was not published until some time after the meeting of Parliament, it was regarded as the reply of a section of the Radicals to the views expressed by Mr. John Morley, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. Herbert Gladstone; the last-named of whom had merely emphasised the views which had been attributed to his father. It appeared, moreover, at a time when the failure of the tentative *régime* of conciliation adopted by Lord Salisbury had become manifest, and after Mr. Parnell had openly announced his conviction that he would get more from Mr. Gladstone than he could obtain from Lord Salisbury's Cabinet, and at the very moment when the result of the transfer of the Irish vote from the Conservative to the Liberal side had become apparent.

Parliament met formally (Jan. 12) for the swearing-in of members and the election of a Speaker of the House of Commons. At one moment there had been rumours of overtures made to the Conservative leaders by the Irish Nationalists, promising their support to any one brought forward in opposition to Mr. Arthur Peel, whose firmness on more than one occasion had aroused their anger. Nothing, however, was heard of this beyond a protest by Mr. Justin McCarthy, who *maintained* that in the previous Parliament Mr. Peel had not

always shown impartiality towards the Irish Nationalists; and on the motion of Sir John Mowbray, seconded by Mr. Bright, Mr. Arthur Peel was again conducted to the Chair, and then congratulated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach) and Mr. Gladstone. On the day following (Jan. 13) the Speaker, having taken the oath and assumed the Chair, reported to the House a correspondence which had taken place between himself and the Chancellor of the Exchequer relative to Mr. Bradlaugh's claim to take the oath. He declared that he could not interpose any objection himself, and he could not permit any motion to be made interposing an objection, to a lawfully elected member taking the oath. Mr. Bradlaugh accordingly took the oath and subscribed the roll of Parliament, the Government reserving the right to prosecute him for sitting and voting without having taken the oath in the sense which the courts of law attributed to it. In the end, however, Mr. Bradlaugh was left in the undisturbed possession of his full rights of membership, and by general consent this thorny question, which had perplexed Parliament during a six years' session, was allowed to drop.

In the interval which elapsed between the meeting of Parliament and the formal opening of the business Lord Carnarvon resigned the Viceroyalty of Ireland, in accordance with the proviso under which he had accepted it in the month of June preceding. It was not unlikely that such a step should attract considerable comment, and it was asserted on all sides that Lord Carnarvon's real reason for withdrawal was the failure which, as he recognised, had attended his efforts to govern Ireland by the common law, and the refusal of the majority of the Cabinet to adopt a policy more in sympathy with the national demand for autonomy. Against these inferences was placed the correspondence which had passed between Lord Carnarvon and Lord Salisbury, at the time of the former's acceptance of the post and at the moment of his resignation. The earlier letters distinctly limited his retention of the office "till after the general election or till after the meeting of Parliament;" the later ones declared not less explicitly that between the Viceroy and the Premier and his colleagues "no difference of opinion as to the policy the former had pursued in Ireland had arisen." Lord Carnarvon's resignation was followed by that of the Chief Secretary, Sir W. Hart-Dyke, it being stated that a Cabinet Minister would be selected for that office in view of the urgent requirements of Irish legislation; and opinions were freely expressed that the Government would either take the opportunity of abolishing the Viceroyalty altogether or else to put it into commission for an indefinite period. But on this, as well as upon their Irish policy, the Government preserved the strictest silence. Lord George Hamilton was the only Cabinet Minister who spoke during this period of suspense; and he limited himself (Jan. 16) to the declaration that "there should be but one law

in the United Kingdom, the law of Parliament and of the Sovereign ; and that while they were ready to concede to Ireland, as they would to any other part of the United Kingdom, certain powers of local government, they would concede to them nothing which directly or indirectly would tend to break up the integrity of the Empire." This was the only reply which the representative of the Government had to make to Mr. G. O. Trevelyan's speech delivered two days previously at the same place (Croydon). On that occasion (Jan. 14) the ex-Secretary for Ireland had claimed for his party and the previous Liberal Ministry the credit of having, in every executive act which concerned the peace of Ireland and the safety of the Empire, been uninfluenced by any attempt to obtain Parliamentary support. Mr. Trevelyan, moreover, declared that throughout the whole period of the Liberal administration violence was never allowed to defeat the power of the law, "and the Queen's writ ran there as it runs in Kent or Sussex." Six months of Tory rule, he argued, had changed all this, and there was then existing in Ireland "a state of things which every true friend of the country must view with shame and dismay ;" but Mr. Trevelyan failed to specify the exact points upon which the condition of Ireland differed from what existed at the time when he resigned the Chief Secretaryship, except that the national feeling expressed itself with greater unanimity. For he went on to say : "The Nationalists in Ireland are united. They speak through the mouth of one man. It is for them, speaking through Mr. Parnell, to tell Parliament definitely and plainly what they want and what they propose ; and then it is for the Government to consider and pronounce authoritatively on their proposal in the name of the people of the United Kingdom. If the present Government is equal to the emergency, it is well ; but if not, they must give place to those who are ; and for my own part I do not believe that this great nation is sunk so low that it cannot find men to deal with such an emergency as this ; and that, having found them, it cannot make up its mind to follow them as a united people."

In conclusion, he referred to the proposals which were being discussed of buying out the Irish landlords "from the slender purses of the hardworked people who supply the Exchequer of the United Kingdom." Such schemes in ordinary hands he pronounced to be most dangerous, but if any were to be adopted, he hoped that it would be under the guidance of Mr. Gladstone, whose soundness and honesty as a financier "would make the difference in the long run of hundreds of millions of pounds to our over-burdened country."

Mr. Trevelyan, however, on this occasion scarcely expressed the views of the party with which he subsequently identified himself. The real or supposed intentions of Mr. Gladstone towards Ireland were already rousing apprehensions in the minds



of the Whig peers, and the Duke of Bedford, acting apparently as the mouthpiece of others, expressed in a letter to the *Times* (Jan. 18) the hope that his "fidelity to party" was not about to be submitted to so severe a test as any attempt by Mr. Gladstone "to use his power in Parliament to hand over the loyal in Ireland to the dominion of the disloyal." The example thus given was followed by Earl Fortescue and the Earl of Essex, and the Duke of Westminster, who had already taken umbrage at the agrarian views of the Gladstonian candidates at the general election, took a further opportunity of expressing his dissent from the Irish policy attributed to the leader of the party.

Meanwhile the public had been awaiting with anxiety some indication of the policy which the Ministry proposed to follow, but nothing was permitted to transpire. Mr. Edward Stanhope was not nominated Chief Secretary, and for the time both that post and the Viceroyalty remained vacant. The most contradictory rumours consequently obtained momentary credence. Ministers, it was said, were about to re-enact the most important clauses of the Crimes Act, and were preparing to send Lord Wolseley to Ireland with full powers to preserve order. The next day it was asserted with equal assurance that the Cabinet, having taken a careful survey of the position, had decided that the task of governing Ireland should not be attempted by a party in a minority in the House of Commons. More probably they were desirous to obtain some clue as to Mr. Gladstone's intentions before finally announcing their own. If such, however, were their hope, it was rudely dispelled by Mr. Gladstone's reply to a request from the Mayor of Belfast to receive a deputation of Irish loyalists of Ulster and elsewhere, which proposed to wait also upon Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington. The object of the deputation was to present memorials from different bodies and places, declaring that the larger part of the country was practically in rebellion against the law, and appealing to Parliament to rescue Ireland from the tyranny of the Land League before extending the power of local self-government. Whilst expressing himself anxious to possess himself of all the information on so important a question, Mr. Gladstone was obliged to decline to receive it through the channel of a public deputation, and he added: "Such a course on my part would exhibit me as a competitor with her Majesty's Government in a field of labour and responsibility which is at present exclusively their own, and would tend to accredit a statement, alike mischievous and groundless, which is now actively propagated from quarters, and with motives that I shall not attempt to describe, to the effect that I have signified an intention to make or adopt proposals with reference to Irish legislation. It is for her Majesty's Ministers, with the means of information they possess, to determine what they may think it their duty to propose. It is for me, as an unofficial member of Parliament, to give to their plans a careful and dispassionate

consideration, and to devise nothing and do nothing which can throw obstacles in the way of their free and independent action."

The reply of the Marquess of Salisbury, after listening to the deputation, was limited to the assurance that Ministers would not be untrue to the responsibilities which lay upon them. A few hours later it was known that Mr. W. H. Smith had been appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland, and that the Viceroyalty remained in commission. The formal meeting of Parliament for the despatch of business (Jan. 21) put an end to many of the rumours which had found easy circulation. In accordance with the precedent set at the assembling of the new Parliament which restored Lord Beaconsfield to power, the state ceremony was performed by the Queen in person, and the speech delivered in her name rehearsed the work of the recess and announced the programme of the business of the coming session. The former referred to the satisfactory adjustment of the boundaries of Afghanistan, the recognition of the rising in Eastern Roumelia, the appointment of a joint commission with Turkey to inquire into the state of Egypt; the announcement of the annexation of the kingdom of Ava, a proposed arrangement with France of the fisheries dispute existing for upwards of a century, and a convention on international copyright. The work of the session was thus foreshadowed:—

*"My Lords and Gentlemen,*

"I regret to say that no material improvement can be noted in the condition of trade or agriculture. I feel the deepest sympathy for the great number of persons, in many vocations of life, who are suffering under a pressure which I trust will prove to be transient.

"I have seen with deep sorrow the renewal since I last addressed you of the attempt to excite the people of Ireland to hostility against the legislative union between that country and Great Britain. I am resolutely opposed to any disturbance of that fundamental law, and in resisting it I am convinced that I shall be heartily supported by my Parliament and my people.

"The social no less than the material condition of that country engages my anxious attention. Although there has been during the last year no marked increase of serious crime, there is in many places a concerted resistance to the enforcement of legal obligations, and I regret that the practice of organised intimidation continues to exist. I have caused every exertion to be used for the detection and punishment of these crimes, and no effort will be spared on the part of my Government to protect my Irish subjects in the exercise of their legal rights and the enjoyment of individual liberty. If, as my information leads me to apprehend, the existing provisions of the law should prove to be inadequate to cope with these growing evils, I look with confidence to your willingness to invest my Government with all *necessary power*"

“ Bills will be submitted to you for transferring to representative councils in the counties of Great Britain local business which is now transacted by the courts of Quarter Sessions and other authorities. A measure for the reform of county government in Ireland is also in preparation. These measures will involve the consideration of the present incidence of local burdens.

“ A bill for facilitating the sale of glebe lands, in a manner adapted to the wants of the rural population, will also be submitted to you ; as also bills for removing the difficulties which prevent the easy and cheap transfer of land ; for mitigating the distressed condition of the poorer classes in the Western Highlands and islands of Scotland ; for the more effectual prevention of accidents in mines ; for extending the powers of the Railway Commission in respect to the regulation of rates ; and for the codification of the criminal law.

“ I trust that results beneficial to the cause of education may issue from a Royal Commission which I have appointed to inquire into the working of the Education Acts.

“ The prompt and effective despatch of the important business which, in an ever-growing proportion, falls to you to transact will, I doubt not, occupy your attention.

“ In these and in all other matters pertaining to your high functions I earnestly commend you to the keeping and guidance of Almighty God.”

In the House of Lords the Address in answer to the Queen's Speech was moved by the Duke of Abercorn, and seconded by the Earl of Scarborough, the former of whom appealed earnestly to the statesmen of all parties to maintain the Union, not only in the interests of the Empire, but in that of all classes of Irishmen. Lord Granville, on behalf of the Opposition, having briefly and not unfavourably criticised the foreign policy of the Government, passed on to the Irish question. He complained that the declaration as to the maintenance of the Union in the Queen's Speech was an abstract one, and that the intimation of the policy to be pursued in Ireland was vague and hypothetical. The excuses made by the Government for not renewing the exceptional legislation which had produced such good effects in Ireland were, he argued, unsatisfactory ; but the real question was, What was the future policy of the Government ? Were they able or not with the ordinary laws to put an end to the existing state of things ? If they were not, there was no use in trifling with the difficulty under the pretence of obtaining further information. The question was a vital and immediate one, and should be dealt with at once. Contrasting, however, Lord Salisbury's speech at Newport in the early summer with that at the Guildhall in November, he could come to no other conclusion than that the Government had no policy at all. The Marquess of Salisbury, *on behalf of the Government*, at once replied that

the language of the Royal speech was, as required by the circumstances of the time, clear and unambiguous ; and in this it differed from that of those who had allowed to go forward without explicit contradiction as expressions of their opinion plans which would be fatal to the maintenance of the legislative union of the Empire. The Government had not proposed a renewal of the Crimes Act on their accession to office for three reasons : (1) Ireland seemed to be returning to a state of order ; (2) the passing of repressive legislation immediately after an extension of the suffrage would be regarded as an attempt to diminish these newly conferred privileges ; and (3) any such proposal would have led to long and exasperating discussions. To some extent, and judged by the critical state of things, Lord Salisbury admitted, the experiment of governing by the ordinary laws had failed : " It certainly has had every chance. It is impossible to exaggerate the care, benevolence, the tact, the skill, which Lord Carnarvon brought to bear on the task of executing the message of conciliation of which he announced in this House that he was the bearer. He did all that man could do, and displayed very high qualities of statesmanship in the task. I still believe that the worst part of that failure, as we see it in the exaggerated symptoms which Ireland shows, is due to the declarations in favour of Home Rule which we believe have been made by leading statesmen. Do not tell me that when a man in the position of Mr. Gladstone has attributed to him opinions at variance with all the opinions of his life, and fatal to the constitution of this country—do not tell me that he is at liberty to skulk behind ambiguous denials, and not to say boldly before the country whether the opinions which apparently with authority are attributed to him are really his or not." Lord Salisbury, in conclusion, declined to anticipate the future action until they had had the opinion of the new Secretary for Ireland on the crisis ; but the House might be assured that the Government would use their utmost efforts to put an end to terrorism in that country. He was at the same time of opinion that there was no difficulty there which might not be surmounted by Parliament pledging itself to a steady and consistent policy. Earl Spencer concurred with Lord Granville that the Government had given no good reason for having allowed the Crimes Act to drop, and after a few further remarks from Lord Ashbourne, the Earl of Kimberley, and others, the Address was agreed to without a division.

In the House of Commons Viscount Curzon moved, and Mr. Houldsworth seconded, the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne, both speakers anticipating that its strong and explicit language would convince the country that the Government were determined to maintain order and protect individual liberty in Ireland. In his place as leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gladstone then rose, and after some preliminary observations said,

th regard to the paragraphs relating to foreign affairs, he joined the congratulations on the settlement of the Zulfikar boundary, d, while not able to approve of all the proceedings of the Russian Government, he hoped that the settlement would be conducive to the peace of the world. So also, as far as he was informed and understood the principal outlines of the Bulgarian question, was pleased to say that the conduct of Lord Salisbury had done him honour, and was in accordance with British feeling. With regard to Egypt he spoke with more reserve, and could not presently perceive the advantages to be derived from the presence of a Turkish commissioner in Cairo; and as to Burmah, he also thought that the House must reserve its opinion until it had seen the papers. But he could not acknowledge the justice of the reasoning of the Queen's Speech. He approved entirely of the proposal to hold inquiries into the working of the Indian Government and the operation of the Education Acts; and, while regretting that no mention had been made of the condition of the agricultural labourers, he also approved the proposal to deal with the sale of glebe lands. Mr. Gladstone then passed to the question of Ireland, prefacing his remarks by a quotation from his election manifesto of the previous September:—

“In my opinion, not now for the first time delivered, the limit is clear within which any desires of Ireland constitutionally ascertained may, and beyond which they cannot, receive the assent of Parliament. To maintain the supremacy of the Crown, the unity of the Empire, and all the authority of Parliament necessary for the conservation of that unity is the first duty of every representative of the people, subject to this governing principle—every grant to portions of the Empire of enlarged powers of the management of their own affairs is, in my view, not a source of danger, but a means of averting it, and is in the nature of a new guarantee for increased cohesion, happiness, and strength.”

This, he declared, was not a view put forward for the first time in the previous autumn, but that which on various occasions, for fourteen or fifteen years, he had expressed without exciting general alarm. Since then, however, he had not “said the word or done one act in extension of that declaration,” beyond showing where responsibility lay. “Responsibility lies,”

continued, “where the means of action lie. In my opinion there could be no greater calamity than to bring this question within the lines of party conflict. If, unhappily, that shall be done—I trust it will not be done of determined purpose by any one—I will, so far as in me lies, take care I will not be the doer. It is the Government alone who can act in such a matter. In my opinion the action of a person in the position I have the honour to hold not only is unnecessary, but would not be warranted, and would be in the highest degree injurious and mischievous; and I will do nothing, as I have said, that can tend



by making proposals, if I were prepared with proposals, to be a challenge to others to bring this question into the category of party controversies. I am bound to say, without expressing a final opinion, that the little I have said has not only been to show how entirely I was separated from all ideas of personal action or party action in the matter, but I have also felt as the season passed on that a new difficulty might be coming into view."

Whilst announcing his intention of waiting to hear the proposals of the Government, he claimed for himself full liberty of action. "I do not intend, so far as lies within my power, to have it determined for me by others at what time and in what manner I shall make any addition to the declaration I laid before the country in the month of September. I stand here as a member of the House, where there are many who have taken their seats for the first time upon these benches, and where there may be some to whom possibly I may avail myself of the privilege of old age to offer a recommendation. I would tell them of my own intention to keep my counsel and reserve my own freedom until I see the occasion when there may be a prospect of public benefit in endeavouring to make a movement forward, and I will venture to recommend them, as an old Parliamentary hand, to do the same."

After this somewhat lengthy preface Mr. Gladstone proceeded to comment on the Irish paragraphs, and said, with regard to the Union first, he accepted it as a solemn declaration in favour of maintaining the Union which he could heartily support, while he held that it would not prevent the Irish members from making whatever demands they had to make. As to the paragraph relating to the social condition of Ireland, he insisted at length that it was entirely inadequate, and called on the Government at once to place the House in possession of fuller information, and also to give some intimation as to what they intended to do, for something more must be done than going on maintaining the Union. "It is an excellent thing," he said, "to say that you will maintain the unity of the Empire. In Heaven's name maintain it with all your might. But you have been maintaining it for eighty-five years; and not only for eighty-five years since the Union, but for six hundred years before. Something more is requisite. Whatever you think is adequate to the case, be it for social order, be it for local government, let us know frankly what it is." With regard to the Local Government Bill, he expressed a fear that it was receding further into the dim distance. Whatever was to be done for Ireland ought to be done at once, and, anxious though he might be to deal with Procedure, he apprehended that the effect of taking it up at once must be to postpone Irish legislation indefinitely.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach), after thanking Mr. Gladstone for his favourable criticisms on the paragraphs relating to foreign affairs, assured the House, with reference to Burmah, that when the papers were produced it would

en that there was no alternative but annexation ; that delay l have led to additional expenditure and difficulty.

in his reply he abstained from commenting at length on Mr. stone's statement as to Ireland, it was due to his not being to understand precisely what was meant by it. "He has l again to-night of the unity of the Empire," said Sir M. s-Beach, "but evidently in his mind the unity of the Empire isistent with the existence of a Parliament here and of er Parliament in Dublin, because he reminded us that the of the Empire had existed, not only for the last eighty-five , but for the last six hundred years. He deprecated any action regard to this subject on his own part—he even said that such action would be injurious. It seems to me that in natter there is something more to be considered than the s of an old Parliamentary hand. I could not overrate the value se in England, and much more in Ireland, who are in favour intaining the legislative union between the two countries of an oken and a frank declaration by the right hon. gentleman ar to that which had fallen from Lord Hartington of his tion to maintain that legislative union about which the hon. gentleman turned and twisted to-night, but with regard ich he said no definite word."

he Chancellor of the Exchequer went on to say that some- more was required than mere Parliamentary tactics, and, dering the rumours which had been afloat and the excite- they created in the Liberal party, he maintained that a te declaration was demanded from Mr. Gladstone on the ion of maintaining the Union. But the Government, he had raised the question in this paragraph deliberately, and e Opposition did not agree with it they could move an dment. But if they did agree with it, he hoped that some- would say so, even if Mr. Gladstone would not. As to the tion of Ireland, there had been a diminution of ordinary , offenders had been punished, and juries had done their

Still, the offence of organised intimidation was on the in- e, and to ascertain whether it could be dealt with by the pre- aw or would require further powers Mr. W. H. Smith would the subject one of anxious inquiry. The result of the general on, Sir M. Hicks-Beach said in conclusion, had been un- n, but nothing could be worse for the country than that its s should be administered by a Government struggling for a rious existence. If the majority disapproved the policy of ters let it say so in the usual manner, but if it wished the nment to remain in office he called upon the House to them the support necessary for the conduct of public ess.

ter Mr. Harrington had attacked the methods by which isive English Ministries had misgoverned Ireland, and Albert Grey had impartially distributed his blame on

Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury, Mr. Parnell managed to occupy the eager attention of the House for a long period, and to sit down without having given any definite clue as to the demands and pretensions of the party of which he was the leader and recognised spokesman. He expressed his wish to acknowledge to the fullest extent his sense that Mr. Gladstone had spoken in a manner worthy of the tradition that attached to his name and to the power he possessed. In reply, however, to his invitation to state the demands which were made by more than five-sixths of the representatives of Ireland, he had no doubt an opportunity would be found at the proper moment. For the present he could only say he had little doubt that if the House approached the question of the government of Ireland in the same spirit and with the same largeness of views as had characterised Mr. Gladstone's speech, such a solution would be found as would enable Ireland to be entrusted with the right of self-government, and secure those guarantees regarding the integrity of the Empire, the supremacy of the Crown, and the protection of what was called the loyal minority in Ireland which had been required by the leaders of both the political parties in the House. He had always believed that if they could come to a discussion—if they could agree upon the principle that the Irish people were entitled to some self-government, that Parliament had to a very large extent failed in its self-imposed task of governing Ireland during the eighty-five years that had elapsed since the Union—they should not find the details so very formidable, or such great difficulties in the way of securing the Empire against the chances of separation which seemed to oppress the public mind in England at the present moment. His own candid opinion was that, so far from increasing the chances of separation, the concession of autonomy to Ireland would undoubtedly very largely diminish them. . . . The testimony of the Government showed that notwithstanding the elastic nature of the Irish character there had been no relapse into serious crimes when the Crimes Act expired. This fact ought to be better known and admitted in England than it appeared to be. Nevertheless, he admitted that, in regard to the question of land, affairs in Ireland were at present very serious. That he deprecated very much. The organisation of which he was the head had done nothing to foment that state of things. On the contrary, so far as his influence and that of his chief friends had been available, it had been used to prevent boycotting and to restrain the movement that had spontaneously sprung up among the people themselves. He did not deny that some extravagant speeches had been made by one or two gentlemen which he deprecated, but they all knew that it was very difficult to put an old head on young shoulders, and young men were sometimes carried away into saying things which in their sober moments they regretted. But it was a noteworthy fact that the present movement was a spontaneous one. Upon



he Land League movement a quarter of a million of money was spent in organising the tenantry to resist the payment of rents which were admittedly rack-rents. That movement resulted in the passing of the Land Act of 1881. But upon the present movement not one single penny had been spent. It was a spontaneous movement. The Irish tenantry were represented as persons desirous of evading their obligations. His experience, on the contrary, had been that they were willing to pay excessive rent so long as they could keep body and soul together, even at the risk of starving their families and themselves. But now their condition had been brought to its present pitch by such a reduction in the prices of agricultural produce as had not been experienced for thirty years, and they had been driven into the present movement for claiming from certain landlords a just reduction of rent. The majority of landlords had, he believed, of their own accord granted such reduction. Some scheme of purchase might be adopted, such as that put forward by Mr. Piffen, under which the bulk of the land in the occupation of agricultural tenants might be purchased.

A sharp encounter followed between Major Saunderson, as the spokesman of the Ulster Conservatives, and Mr. Healy, as champion of the Irish Nationalists; after which Lord Randolph Churchill rose, and prefaced his remarks by the suggestion that the debate on the Address might be brought to a close that evening, and the various amendments discussed subsequently. The obvious results of such an arrangement would have been that, in pursuance of the notice given by Sir M. Hicks-Beach at the opening of the sitting, the new rules of Parliamentary procedure would be forthwith taken up. In the interval occasioned by their discussion Mr. W. H. Smith, who had been despatched in all haste to Ireland, might have made his report, and the Government would be in a position to state definitely the policy they were prepared to adopt. As a reason for this course he urged that the principal speeches which had been delivered that day, including the Queen's Speech, had been more or less surprises to the public. The chief surprise was Mr. Parnell's avoidance of the challenge thrown out in the Queen's Speech as to the maintenance of the Union. Another reason was the then condition of the front Liberal bench (on which there were three members), suggestive of no intention of displacing the Government at that moment, so that a prolonged discussion of the general question, which would delay the commencement of business, was undesirable at that moment. Though the Government were aware that they were in a minority, they were not aware that any other party was in a majority, and they remained in office not for the pleasure of governing but to do their duty. As long as they could do that on reasonably honourable terms they would be content. Before sitting down Lord R. Churchill emphatically repudiated the supposition that any Local Govern-

in the United Kingdom, the law of Parliament and of the Sovereign ; and that while they were ready to concede to Ireland, as they would to any other part of the United Kingdom, certain powers of local government, they would concede to them nothing which directly or indirectly would tend to break up the integrity of the Empire." This was the only reply which the representative of the Government had to make to Mr. G. O. Trevelyan's speech delivered two days previously at the same place (Croydon). On that occasion (Jan. 14) the ex-Secretary for Ireland had claimed for his party and the previous Liberal Ministry the credit of having, in every executive act which concerned the peace of Ireland and the safety of the Empire, been uninfluenced by any attempt to obtain Parliamentary support. Mr. Trevelyan, moreover, declared that throughout the whole period of the Liberal administration violence was never allowed to defeat the power of the law, "and the Queen's writ ran there as it runs in Kent or Sussex." Six months of Tory rule, he argued, had changed all this, and there was then existing in Ireland "a state of things which every true friend of the country must view with shame and dismay ;" but Mr. Trevelyan failed to specify the exact points upon which the condition of Ireland differed from what existed at the time when he resigned the Chief Secretaryship, except that the national feeling expressed itself with greater unanimity. For he went on to say : "The Nationalists in Ireland are united. They speak through the mouth of one man. It is for them, speaking through Mr. Parnell, to tell Parliament definitely and plainly what they want and what they propose ; and then it is for the Government to consider and pronounce authoritatively on their proposal in the name of the people of the United Kingdom. If the present Government is equal to the emergency, it is well ; but if not, they must give place to those who are ; and for my own part I do not believe that this great nation is sunk so low that it cannot find men to deal with such an emergency as this ; and that, having found them, it cannot make up its mind to follow them as a united people."

In conclusion, he referred to the proposals which were being discussed of buying out the Irish landlords "from the slender purses of the hardworked people who supply the Exchequer of the United Kingdom." Such schemes in ordinary hands he pronounced to be most dangerous, but if any were to be adopted, he hoped that it would be under the guidance of Mr. Gladstone, whose soundness and honesty as a financier "would make the difference in the long run of hundreds of millions of pounds to our over-burdened country."

Mr. Trevelyan, however, on this occasion scarcely expressed the views of the party with which he subsequently identified himself. The real or supposed intentions of Mr. Gladstone towards Ireland were already rousing apprehensions in the minds

of the Whig peers, and the Duke of Bedford, acting apparently as the mouthpiece of others, expressed in a letter to the *Times* (Jan. 18) the hope that his "fidelity to party" was not about to be submitted to so severe a test as any attempt by Mr. Gladstone "to use his power in Parliament to hand over the loyal in Ireland to the dominion of the disloyal." The example thus given was followed by Earl Fortescue and the Earl of Essex, and the Duke of Westminster, who had already taken umbrage at the agrarian views of the Gladstonian candidates at the general election, took a further opportunity of expressing his dissent from the Irish policy attributed to the leader of the party.

Meanwhile the public had been awaiting with anxiety some indication of the policy which the Ministry proposed to follow, but nothing was permitted to transpire. Mr. Edward Stanhope was not nominated Chief Secretary, and for the time both that post and the Viceroyalty remained vacant. The most contradictory rumours consequently obtained momentary credence. Ministers, it was said, were about to re-enact the most important clauses of the Crimes Act, and were preparing to send Lord Wolseley to Ireland with full powers to preserve order. The next day it was asserted with equal assurance that the Cabinet, having taken a careful survey of the position, had decided that the task of governing Ireland should not be attempted by a party in a minority in the House of Commons. More probably they were desirous to obtain some clue as to Mr. Gladstone's intentions before finally announcing their own. If such, however, were their hope, it was rudely dispelled by Mr. Gladstone's reply to a request from the Mayor of Belfast to receive a deputation of Irish loyalists of Ulster and elsewhere, which proposed to wait also upon Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington. The object of the deputation was to present memorials from different bodies and places, declaring that the larger part of the country was practically in rebellion against the law, and appealing to Parliament to rescue Ireland from the tyranny of the Land League before extending the power of local self-government. Whilst expressing himself anxious to possess himself of all the information on so important a question, Mr. Gladstone was obliged to decline to receive it through the channel of a public deputation, and he added: "Such a course on my part would exhibit me as a competitor with her Majesty's Government in a field of labour and responsibility which is at present exclusively their own, and would tend to accredit a statement, alike mischievous and groundless, which is now actively propagated from quarters, and with motives that I shall not attempt to describe, to the effect that I have signified an intention to make or adopt proposals with reference to Irish legislation. It is for her Majesty's Ministers, with the means of information they possess, to determine what they may think it their duty to propose. It is for me, as an unofficial member of Parliament, to give to their plans a careful and dispassionate

consideration, and to devise nothing and do nothing which can throw obstacles in the way of their free and independent action."

The reply of the Marquess of Salisbury, after listening to the deputation, was limited to the assurance that Ministers would not be untrue to the responsibilities which lay upon them. A few hours later it was known that Mr. W. H. Smith had been appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland, and that the Viceroyalty remained in commission. The formal meeting of Parliament for the despatch of business (Jan. 21) put an end to many of the rumours which had found easy circulation. In accordance with the precedent set at the assembling of the new Parliament which restored Lord Beaconsfield to power, the state ceremony was performed by the Queen in person, and the speech delivered in her name rehearsed the work of the recess and announced the programme of the business of the coming session. The former referred to the satisfactory adjustment of the boundaries of Afghanistan, the recognition of the rising in Eastern Roumelia, the appointment of a joint commission with Turkey to inquire into the state of Egypt; the announcement of the annexation of the kingdom of Ava, a proposed arrangement with France of the fisheries dispute existing for upwards of a century, and a convention on international copyright. The work of the session was thus foreshadowed:—

*"My Lords and Gentlemen,*

"I regret to say that no material improvement can be noted in the condition of trade or agriculture. I feel the deepest sympathy for the great number of persons, in many vocations of life, who are suffering under a pressure which I trust will prove to be transient.

"I have seen with deep sorrow the renewal since I last addressed you of the attempt to excite the people of Ireland to hostility against the legislative union between that country and Great Britain. I am resolutely opposed to any disturbance of that fundamental law, and in resisting it I am convinced that I shall be heartily supported by my Parliament and my people.

"The social no less than the material condition of that country engages my anxious attention. Although there has been during the last year no marked increase of serious crime, there is in many places a concerted resistance to the enforcement of legal obligations, and I regret that the practice of organised intimidation continues to exist. I have caused every exertion to be used for the detection and punishment of these crimes, and no effort will be spared on the part of my Government to protect my Irish subjects in the exercise of their legal rights and the enjoyment of individual liberty. If, as my information leads me to apprehend, the existing provisions of the law should prove to be inadequate to cope with these growing evils, I look with confidence to your willingness to invest my Government with all necessary powers."

“ Bills will be submitted to you for transferring to representative councils in the counties of Great Britain local business which is now transacted by the courts of Quarter Sessions and other authorities. A measure for the reform of county government in Ireland is also in preparation. These measures will involve the consideration of the present incidence of local burdens.

“ A bill for facilitating the sale of glebe lands, in a manner adapted to the wants of the rural population, will also be submitted to you ; as also bills for removing the difficulties which prevent the easy and cheap transfer of land ; for mitigating the distressed condition of the poorer classes in the Western Highlands and islands of Scotland ; for the more effectual prevention of accidents in mines ; for extending the powers of the Railway Commission in respect to the regulation of rates ; and for the modification of the criminal law.

“ I trust that results beneficial to the cause of education may issue from a Royal Commission which I have appointed to inquire into the working of the Education Acts.

“ The prompt and effective despatch of the important business which, in an ever-growing proportion, falls to you to transact will, I doubt not, occupy your attention.

“ In these and in all other matters pertaining to your high functions I earnestly commend you to the keeping and guidance of Almighty God.”

In the House of Lords the Address in answer to the Queen's speech was moved by the Duke of Abercorn, and seconded by the Earl of Scarborough, the former of whom appealed earnestly to the statesmen of all parties to maintain the Union, not only in the interests of the Empire, but in that of all classes of Irishmen. Lord Granville, on behalf of the Opposition, having briefly and not unfavourably criticised the foreign policy of the Government, passed on to the Irish question. He complained that the declaration as to the maintenance of the Union in the Queen's Speech was an abstract one, and that the intimation of the policy to be pursued in Ireland was vague and hypothetical. The excuses made by the Government for not renewing the exceptional legislation which had produced such good effects in Ireland were, he argued, unsatisfactory ; but the real question was, What was the future policy of the Government ? Were they able or not with the ordinary laws to put an end to the existing state of things ? If they were not, there was no use in trifling with the difficulty under the pretence of obtaining further information. The question was a vital and immediate one, and should be dealt with at once. Contrasting, however, Lord Salisbury's speech at Newport in the early summer with that at the Guildhall in November, he could come to no other conclusion than that the Government had no policy at all. The Marquess of Salisbury, on behalf of the Government, at once replied that



the language of the Royal speech was, as required by the circumstances of the time, clear and unambiguous ; and in this it differed from that of those who had allowed to go forward without explicit contradiction as expressions of their opinion plans which would be fatal to the maintenance of the legislative union of the Empire. The Government had not proposed a renewal of the Crimes Act on their accession to office for three reasons : (1) Ireland seemed to be returning to a state of order ; (2) the passing of repressive legislation immediately after an extension of the suffrage would be regarded as an attempt to diminish these newly conferred privileges ; and (3) any such proposal would have led to long and exasperating discussions. To some extent, and judged by the critical state of things, Lord Salisbury admitted, the experiment of governing by the ordinary laws had failed : “ It certainly has had every chance. It is impossible to exaggerate the care, benevolence, the tact, the skill, which Lord Carnarvon brought to bear on the task of executing the message of conciliation of which he announced in this House that he was the bearer. He did all that man could do, and displayed very high qualities of statesmanship in the task. I still believe that the worst part of that failure, as we see it in the exaggerated symptoms which Ireland shows, is due to the declarations in favour of Home Rule which we believe have been made by leading statesmen. Do not tell me that when a man in the position of Mr. Gladstone has attributed to him opinions at variance with all the opinions of his life, and fatal to the constitution of this country—do not tell me that he is at liberty to skulk behind ambiguous denials, and not to say boldly before the country whether the opinions which apparently with authority are attributed to him are really his or not.” Lord Salisbury, in conclusion, declined to anticipate the future action until they had had the opinion of the new Secretary for Ireland on the crisis ; but the House might be assured that the Government would use their utmost efforts to put an end to terrorism in that country. He was at the same time of opinion that there was no difficulty there which might not be surmounted by Parliament pledging itself to a steady and consistent policy. Earl Spencer concurred with Lord Granville that the Government had given no good reason for having allowed the Crimes Act to drop, and after a few further remarks from Lord Ashbourne, the Earl of Kimberley, and others, the Address was agreed to without a division.

In the House of Commons Viscount Curzon moved, and Mr. Houldsworth seconded, the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne, both speakers anticipating that its strong and explicit language would convince the country that the Government were determined to maintain order and protect individual liberty in Ireland. In his place as leader of the Opposition, Mr. Gladstone then rose, and after some preliminary observations said,

with regard to the paragraphs relating to foreign affairs, he joined in the congratulations on the settlement of the Zulfikar boundary, and, while not able to approve of all the proceedings of the Russian Government, he hoped that the settlement would be conducive to the peace of the world. So also, as far as he was informed and understood the principal outlines of the Bulgarian question, he was pleased to say that the conduct of Lord Salisbury had done him honour, and was in accordance with British feeling. With regard to Egypt he spoke with more reserve, and could not at present perceive the advantages to be derived from the presence of a Turkish commissioner in Cairo; and as to Burmah, he also thought that the House must reserve its opinion until it had seen the papers. But he could not acknowledge the justice of the reasoning of the Queen's Speech. He approved entirely of the proposal to hold inquiries into the working of the Indian Government and the operation of the Education Acts; and, while regretting that no mention had been made of the condition of the agricultural labourers, he also approved the proposal to deal with the sale of glebe lands. Mr. Gladstone then passed to the question of Ireland, prefacing his remarks by a quotation from his election manifesto of the previous September:—

“In my opinion, not now for the first time delivered, the limit is clear within which any desires of Ireland constitutionally ascertained may, and beyond which they cannot, receive the assent of Parliament. To maintain the supremacy of the Crown, the unity of the Empire, and all the authority of Parliament necessary for the conservation of that unity is the first duty of every representative of the people, subject to this governing principle—every grant to portions of the Empire of enlarged powers for the management of their own affairs is, in my view, not a source of danger, but a means of averting it, and is in the nature of a new guarantee for increased cohesion, happiness, and strength.”

This, he declared, was not a view put forward for the first time in the previous autumn, but that which on various occasions, for fourteen or fifteen years, he had expressed without exciting general alarm. Since then, however, he had not “said one word or done one act in extension of that declaration,” beyond showing where responsibility lay. “Responsibility lies,” he continued, “where the means of action lie. In my opinion there could be no greater calamity than to bring this question within the lines of party conflict. If, unhappily, that shall be done—I trust it will not be done of determined purpose by any one—I will, so far as in me lies, take care I will not be the doer. It is the Government alone who can act in such a matter. In my opinion the action of a person in the position I have the honour to hold not only is unnecessary, but would not be warrantable, and would be in the highest degree injurious and mischievous; and I will do nothing, as I have said, that can tend

by making proposals, if I were prepared with proposals, to be a challenge to others to bring this question into the category of party controversies. I am bound to say, without expressing a final opinion, that the little I have said has not only been to show how entirely I was separated from all ideas of personal action or party action in the matter, but I have also felt as the season passed on that a new difficulty might be coming into view."

Whilst announcing his intention of waiting to hear the proposals of the Government, he claimed for himself full liberty of action. "I do not intend, so far as lies within my power, to have it determined for me by others at what time and in what manner I shall make any addition to the declaration I laid before the country in the month of September. I stand here as a member of the House, where there are many who have taken their seats for the first time upon these benches, and where there may be some to whom possibly I may avail myself of the privilege of old age to offer a recommendation. I would tell them of my own intention to keep my counsel and reserve my own freedom until I see the occasion when there may be a prospect of public benefit in endeavouring to make a movement forward, and I will venture to recommend them, as an old Parliamentary hand, to do the same."

After this somewhat lengthy preface Mr. Gladstone proceeded to comment on the Irish paragraphs, and said, with regard to the Union first, he accepted it as a solemn declaration in favour of maintaining the Union which he could heartily support, while he held that it would not prevent the Irish members from making whatever demands they had to make. As to the paragraph relating to the social condition of Ireland, he insisted at length that it was entirely inadequate, and called on the Government at once to place the House in possession of fuller information, and also to give some intimation as to what they intended to do, for something more must be done than going on maintaining the Union. "It is an excellent thing," he said, "to say that you will maintain the unity of the Empire. In Heaven's name maintain it with all your might. But you have been maintaining it for eighty-five years; and not only for eighty-five years since the Union, but for six hundred years before. Something more is requisite. Whatever you think is adequate to the case, be it for social order, be it for local government, let us know frankly what it is." With regard to the Local Government Bill, he expressed a fear that it was receding further into the dim distance. Whatever was to be done for Ireland ought to be done at once, and, anxious though he might be to deal with Procedure, he apprehended that the effect of taking it up at once must be to postpone Irish legislation indefinitely.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir M. Hicks-Beach), after thanking Mr. Gladstone for his favourable criticisms on the paragraphs relating to foreign affairs, assured the House, with reference to Burmah, that when the papers were produced it would



en that there was no alternative but annexation ; that delay  
l have led to additional expenditure and difficulty.

in his reply he abstained from commenting at length on Mr.  
stone's statement as to Ireland, it was due to his not being  
to understand precisely what was meant by it. "He has  
l again to-night of the unity of the Empire," said Sir M.  
s-Beach, "but evidently in his mind the unity of the Empire  
nsistent with the existence of a Parliament here and of  
er Parliament in Dublin, because he reminded us that the  
of the Empire had existed, not only for the last eighty-five  
, but for the last six hundred years. He deprecated any action  
regard to this subject on his own part—he even said that  
such action would be injurious. It seems to me that in  
natter there is something more to be considered than the  
s of an old Parliamentary hand. I could not overrate the value  
se in England, and much more in Ireland, who are in favour  
intaining the legislative union between the two countries of an  
oken and a frank declaration by the right hon. gentleman  
ar to that which had fallen from Lord Hartington of his  
tion to maintain that legislative union about which the  
hon. gentleman turned and twisted to-night, but with regard  
ich he said no definite word."

he Chancellor of the Exchequer went on to say that some-  
more was required than mere Parliamentary tactics, and,  
dering the rumours which had been afloat and the excite-  
they created in the Liberal party, he maintained that a  
ite declaration was demanded from Mr. Gladstone on the  
ion of maintaining the Union. But the Government, he  
had raised the question in this paragraph deliberately, and  
e Opposition did not agree with it they could move an  
dment. But if they did agree with it, he hoped that some-  
would say so, even if Mr. Gladstone would not. As to the  
tion of Ireland, there had been a diminution of ordinary  
, offenders had been punished, and juries had done their

Still, the offence of organised intimidation was on the in-  
e, and to ascertain whether it could be dealt with by the pre-  
aw or would require further powers Mr. W. H. Smith would  
the subject one of anxious inquiry. The result of the general  
on, Sir M. Hicks-Beach said in conclusion, had been un-  
n, but nothing could be worse for the country than that its  
s should be administered by a Government struggling for a  
rious existence. If the majority disapproved the policy of  
ters let it say so in the usual manner, but if it wished the  
nment to remain in office he called upon the House to  
them the support necessary for the conduct of public  
ess.

fter Mr. Harrington had attacked the methods by which  
isive English Ministries had misgoverned Ireland, and  
Albert Grey had impartially distributed his blame on

Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury, Mr. Parnell managed to occupy the eager attention of the House for a long period, and to sit down without having given any definite clue as to the demands and pretensions of the party of which he was the leader and recognised spokesman. He expressed his wish to acknowledge to the fullest extent his sense that Mr. Gladstone had spoken in a manner worthy of the tradition that attached to his name and to the power he possessed. In reply, however, to his invitation to state the demands which were made by more than five-sixths of the representatives of Ireland, he had no doubt an opportunity would be found at the proper moment. For the present he could only say he had little doubt that if the House approached the question of the government of Ireland in the same spirit and with the same largeness of views as had characterised Mr. Gladstone's speech, such a solution would be found as would enable Ireland to be entrusted with the right of self-government, and secure those guarantees regarding the integrity of the Empire, the supremacy of the Crown, and the protection of what was called the loyal minority in Ireland which had been required by the leaders of both the political parties in the House. He had always believed that if they could come to a discussion—if they could agree upon the principle that the Irish people were entitled to some self-government, that Parliament had to a very large extent failed in its self-imposed task of governing Ireland during the eighty-five years that had elapsed since the Union—they should not find the details so very formidable, or such great difficulties in the way of securing the Empire against the chances of separation which seemed to oppress the public mind in England at the present moment. His own candid opinion was that, so far from increasing the chances of separation, the concession of autonomy to Ireland would undoubtedly very largely diminish them. . . . The testimony of the Government showed that notwithstanding the elastic nature of the Irish character there had been no relapse into serious crimes when the Crimes Act expired. This fact ought to be better known and admitted in England than it appeared to be. Nevertheless, he admitted that, in regard to the question of land, affairs in Ireland were at present very serious. That he deprecated very much. The organisation of which he was the head had done nothing to foment that state of things. On the contrary, so far as his influence and that of his chief friends had been available, it had been used to prevent boycotting and to restrain the movement that had spontaneously sprung up among the people themselves. He did not deny that some extravagant speeches had been made by one or two gentlemen which he deprecated, but they all knew that it was very difficult to put an old head on young shoulders, and young men were sometimes carried away into saying things which in their sober moments they regretted. But it was a noteworthy fact that the present movement was a spontaneous one. Upon

he Land League movement a quarter of a million of money was spent in organising the tenantry to resist the payment of rents which were admittedly rack-rents. That movement resulted in the passing of the Land Act of 1881. But upon the present movement not one single penny had been spent. It was a spontaneous movement. The Irish tenantry were represented as persons desirous of evading their obligations. His experience, on the contrary, had been that they were willing to pay excessive rent so long as they could keep body and soul together, even at the risk of starving their families and themselves. But now their condition had been brought to its present pitch by such a reduction in the prices of agricultural produce as had not been experienced for thirty years, and they had been driven into the present movement for claiming from certain landlords a just reduction of rent. The majority of landlords had, he believed, of their own accord granted such reduction. Some scheme of purchase might be adopted, such as that put forward by Mr. Biffen, under which the bulk of the land in the occupation of agricultural tenants might be purchased.

A sharp encounter followed between Major Saunderson, as the spokesman of the Ulster Conservatives, and Mr. Healy, as champion of the Irish Nationalists; after which Lord Randolph Churchill rose, and prefaced his remarks by the suggestion that the debate on the Address might be brought to a close that evening, and the various amendments discussed subsequently. The obvious results of such an arrangement would have been that, in pursuance of the notice given by Sir M. Hicks-Beach at the opening of the sitting, the new rules of Parliamentary procedure would be forthwith taken up. In the interval occasioned by their discussion Mr. W. H. Smith, who had been despatched in all haste to Ireland, might have made his report, and the Government would be in a position to state definitely the policy they were prepared to adopt. As a reason for this course he urged that the principal speeches which had been delivered that day, including the Queen's Speech, had been more or less surprises to the public. The chief surprise was Mr. Parnell's avoidance of the challenge thrown out in the Queen's Speech as to the maintenance of the Union. Another reason was the then condition of the front Liberal bench (on which there were three members), suggestive of no intention of displacing the Government at that moment, so that a prolonged discussion of the general question, which would delay the commencement of business, was undesirable at that moment. Though the Government were aware that they were in a minority, they were not aware that any other party was in a majority, and they remained in office not for the pleasure of governing but to do their duty. As long as they could do that on reasonably honourable terms they would be content. Before sitting down Lord R. Churchill emphatically repudiated the supposition that any Local Govern-

ment Bill for Ireland which the Government was likely to introduce could possibly contain the germs of a separate parliament. "If," urged Lord Randolph Churchill, "circumstances were favourable for the introduction of the Local Government Bill for Ireland, it would not come within any measurable distance of that which I believe to be Mr. Parnell's object. It would be the wish of her Majesty's Government to introduce into Ireland, if only peace and order prevailed, the same state of law as prevails in this country, and to introduce a measure of local government in Ireland as similar as possible to the local government in England. I do not know whether there is likely to be any change of circumstances in Ireland that might possibly encourage her Majesty's Government to press forward upon the attention of Parliament a measure with the object such as I have described, but this I will say, that the present state of Ireland is not, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, one which would be favourable to the consideration of any measure extending local government in Ireland. The measure is under consideration, and many of its leading features may have been already determined, but for bringing it forward the time has not yet come, and I do not know whether it will. I would hope that it might. We cannot conceal from ourselves that the state of things in that country is not a state of things which would justify us in discussing any extension of local government."

It is necessary here to turn aside for a moment to refer to the subject which Lord R. Churchill urged upon the consideration of the House.

The new rules of procedure were in themselves startling and sweeping enough to give a Ministry an excuse for resignation, if, as was hinted in some quarters, that was the design of the Cabinet in asking for their immediate discussion. The rules proposed: (1) To hold morning sittings on every day except Wednesday, when the House would meet as usual at noon. (2) The House to adjourn from 7 p.m. to 9 p.m., and at midnight the sittings would be broken off unless the House decided to go on till 12.30, when the adjournment would be imperative, and no opposed business should be taken after midnight. (3) Every public, not being a Ways and Means, bill after the second reading would, unless the House specially ordered otherwise, stand referred to a Public Bill Select Committee, such committee consisting of not more than forty nor less than thirty members. (4) Where bills had been reported from the Public Bills Select Committee without amendment, the report stage would be abolished and the bill put down for third reading; but (5) when the bill had been amended it would be put down for consideration, but the third reading would then be taken without amendment or debate. (6) On going into committee on a bill the Speaker would leave the chair without putting any question, *unless notice of an instruction had been previously given.*

(7) Ten minutes' interval must elapse between the two counts necessary before the House could be adjourned. (8) No questions to be asked without notice, and notice of all questions to be given in writing. (9) Answers to the questions to be printed with the votes. (10) Motions for an adjournment must be supported by 100 instead of 40 members. (11) Parliament would adjourn each year in July, and meet for an autumn session in October.

In estimating the value of these rules, it was agreed on all sides that at any rate they did not err on the side of timidity; and inasmuch as Mr. Gladstone especially, and some of his prominent adherents in a lesser degree, had insisted upon the absolute necessity of reforming procedure before the new Parliament set to work upon legislation, it might have been supposed that the Ministerial propositions would be subjected to discussion of some kind. Mr. Gladstone, however, found no difficulty in satisfying his party that circumstances no longer required a rigid adherence to his election manifesto. The reform of procedure should, it was true, take precedence of ordinary legislation; but the requirements of Ireland placed all matters relating to that country within the category of extraordinary legislation.

On this ground Lord R. Churchill's suggestion to close the debate summarily was ignored, and the discussion on the Address prolonged. Mr. Sexton's speech was the only one on the second night which attracted attention. His principal object was to prove that, in order to produce a certain result at the polls, the Government had refrained from saying a word to intimate that they were opposed to a settlement of the Irish question which was not inconsistent with Imperial authority and the rights of the minority. Mr. Sexton then went on to argue that there was nothing in the desires of the Irish people inconsistent with the securities proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and being challenged now the Irish members would have the right to choose their own weapons. No case for coercion had been made out, and it would be resisted inch by inch. He vindicated boycotting as the alternative of outrages, and, at great length, argued that the Nationalist members represented five-sixths of the Irish people. While maintaining that it was the duty of Irishmen merely to state their grievances and to leave the responsible Government to provide the remedies, he denied that it was the intention or the wish of the Nationalist party to endanger the integrity of the Empire, the supremacy of the Crown, or the power of the English Parliament.

The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Hugh Holmes, Q.C.) pointed out that there was no ambiguity in the language used by Nationalists during the recent elections, which, he said, was an unmistakable threat to bring about the disintegration of the Empire. While admitting that the paragraph in the Queen's Speech relating to Ireland was unusual, he denied that it was unconstitutional, and justified it on the ground that, under the



circumstances, it was indispensable. He controverted the statement that the Government wanted a policy found for them; it had, he said, been clearly expressed in the Queen's Speech, and unmistakably explained by Lord R. Churchill. Dealing with the policy and actions of the National League, he said it did not confine itself to interfering between landlords and tenants, but maintained that it sought to substitute generally its laws for those of the country. The Government had received information from confidential officials which pointed clearly to the accuracy of the statement in the Queen's Speech; but they did not, alone, rely upon that information. They relied upon other well-known facts, which, he argued, conclusively proved that the National League unwarrantably interfered with the Irish people in all their social relations. The League had been growing ever since 1883. At the end of the following year it had 592 branches, which had risen to 800 previous to the late elections, and at the close of the year it had 1,200 branches. It was to remedy this state of things that the paragraph in the Queen's Speech was inserted, but he did not consider that with a change in the administration of Ireland impending it was reasonable to expect the Government to definitely state at present what measures might be necessary to secure good order and obedience to the law.

A few other speeches followed, and after an ineffective appeal by the Hon. A. Elliot to the members of the front Opposition bench, especially to Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, to state their views of Home Rule, the subject was allowed to drop. The Ministry, perhaps thinking the danger of the moment had passed, hurriedly despatched Mr. W. H. Smith to Dublin (Jan. 23), and Lord Cranbrook was gazetted to the vacant Secretaryship for War. The third night of the debate on the Address (Jan. 25) opened auspiciously for the Government. Mr. W. A. Hunter's amendment, expressing regret that the expedition to Burmah had been defrayed out of the revenues of India without the sanction of Parliament, was withdrawn after a short debate, and on the advice of Mr. Gladstone that a more favourable opportunity for taking the sense of the House would arise on the discussion of the Indian Budget. Another amendment was moved by Mr. Barclay, representing "the pressing necessity for securing without delay to the cultivators of the soil such conditions of tenure as will aid and encourage them to meet the new and trying circumstances in which the agriculture of the country is placed." He denounced the Agricultural Holdings Act as a delusion and a snare, affirming that the clause which provided that tenants should not be compensated for improvements due to the inherent capabilities of the soil was made to shelter the landlord in many cases where the improvements had been done by the tenants; whilst, on the other hand, landlords had availed themselves in an unfair way of the clause enabling them to prefer counter-claims against the tenants. Finally, Mr. Barclay,

adopting the views hitherto supposed to be the exclusive property of doctrinaire Socialists, demanded that the State should secure to the cultivator "a fair rent, a fair price for the raw material he dealt with, and such conditions of cultivation as would enable him to make the most of his land and secure the capital he had invested in it." In reply, the Lord Advocate (Mr. J. H. A. Macdonald) contrasted the present resolution and the attitude of its supporters with that assumed by them towards the Commission appointed to ascertain the causes of trade depression. He defended the Scotch system of nineteen years' leases, which had proved beneficial to the farmers; and as a remedy to the state of depression he recommended emigration. Mr. Chaplin followed on the same side, and declared that the farmer was now master of the situation, and if he did not make an agreement with his landlord assuring to himself freedom of cultivation, security of capital, and moderate rent, it was his own fault. The amendment was ultimately negatived by 211 to 183, the Liberal leaders abstaining from the division, as they had from the debate.

Meanwhile, in the House of Lords, after the Marquess of Salisbury had given a pledge, repeated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the procedure resolutions would not be allowed to delay the presentation of the Government measure for re-establishing order in Ireland, Lord Kilmorey moved in a long and interesting speech that the post of Lord Lieutenant might with advantage be abolished. It was true that the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland had existed for more than seven hundred years, but that was no reason why it should exist for ever. Experience had shown that it was not of advantage to the country; and when a Parliamentary movement was made against it in 1850 and 1858, the arguments used in favour of its retention were very curious. Irish history, Lord Kilmorey declared, repeated itself with the fidelity of the stock piece of a provincial theatre: the play was always the same, though the actors were changed from time to time. Lord Russell in 1850 referred to a Bradshaw's Guide to show how much the communications between England and Ireland had been accelerated since the beginning of the present century; but, seeing how vastly they had been accelerated since 1850, the argument in favour of the abolition of the office then urged had been very greatly strengthened. The Prime Minister at Downing Street might now hold a conversation with the Chief Secretary for Ireland at Dublin Castle, and the Duke of Cambridge at the War Office might confer with the Commander of the Forces in Ireland while the latter was at his quarters in the Royal Hospital. The Viceregal system, Lord Kilmorey maintained, was a bad one. It was an evil to have the Lord Lieutenant a member of a political party, because, being so, he was bound to administer the affairs of the office in a party spirit. He would therefore abolish the Viceroyalty, and transfer the *administrative functions* of that office to the Secretary of

State, and he expressed the opinion that, if the Irish people had greater facilities of seeing real instead of mock Royalty, the results would be better than any that could be effected by the retention of the Viceroyalty.

Earl Cowper, who had filled the office of Lord Lieutenant, cordially supported the resolution, for whilst the State functions were pleasurable because of the nature of the Irish themselves, the administrative functions, he thought, might be better discharged by a Secretary of State. The Irish members who advocated Home Rule had recently shown themselves to be in favour of the retention of the Lord Lieutenancy, because they knew that if Ireland was to have a Parliament she must, like Canada, have a Governor. The question of the day was Home Rule for Ireland, and as he was one of those who thought that such a system was an impossibility—that we could never hear of a separate Parliament for Ireland—he thought this would be an opportune moment to do away with the office, and thus show the determination of the Imperial Parliament that Ireland was not to have a separate constitution.

Lord Howth and Lord Fortescue were in favour of abolishing the Viceroyalty; but Lord Fitzgerald thought the time was not opportune for the proposition before the House.

Lord Salisbury held that above all the moment was not one at which so great a change should be effected hurriedly. The Viceroyalty, he urged, was a survival, and there was much which might be said for its abolition. He concurred, moreover, with Lord Cowper as to the anomaly of the position of the Lord Lieutenant in relation to that of his Chief Secretary, when the former was not a member of the Cabinet and the latter was, and he rejoiced to hear the outspoken language of his noble friend in reference to Home Rule; but he did not know that any Irish party was asking for the abolition of the Lord Lieutenancy now, and if it were now abolished there might be a cry that this was another step in the direction of centralisation. Again, the Viceroyal Court caused an expenditure of money among the trading classes of Dublin, and this was not perhaps the best time to take a step which would have the effect of diminishing the expenditure of money there. The arguments in favour of the motion were not so overwhelming that the Government could accede to it without a dereliction of their duty. From the Liberal side of the House, Lord Kimberley, while on the whole in favour of the abolition of the Viceroyalty, pointed out that there were difficulties of arrangement which would have to be provided for before the administrative functions of the Lord Lieutenant could be transferred to another official; and, moreover, the Lord Lieutenancy could not be dealt with apart from the whole question of Irish affairs.

There was probably no intention on the part of the mover of *the resolution* to divide the House, and it was accordingly with-



drawn, after having elicited the evidence of a strong opinion on both sides of the House that the office of Viceroy was at least an anachronism.

The dangers to which the Ministry had been exposed from Mr. Parnell and Mr. Barclay having been successfully averted, it might reasonably have been supposed that Mr. Jesse Collings would be scarcely more successful in pledging the House to adopt hurriedly a clause of the "unauthorised programme," in spite of its attractions for the rural voter. But the hesitations and vacillations of the Cabinet were destined to bring about its overthrow. On the reassembling of the House (Jan. 26) the Chancellor of the Exchequer suddenly gave notice that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would, two days later, move for leave to introduce a bill for the purpose of suppressing the National League and other dangerous associations, for the prevention of intimidation, and for the protection of life, property, and public order in Ireland. Scarcely eight-and-forty hours could have elapsed between Mr. W. H. Smith's arrival in Dublin and his arrival at the conviction that the re-establishment of some form of coercion was absolutely necessary; and with no less despatch the Opposition whips thought themselves supported by sufficient numbers, in spite of the probable defections on their own side, to place the Government in a minority. Mr. Jesse Collings's amendment furnished the required excuse; and it was the more important to the Liberals to force a critical division on such a question, as by so doing they would be under no obligation to explain their views with regard to Ireland. Sir M. Hicks-Beach's announcement, to which was added the promise of a bill dealing with the Land question, was consequently followed by a display of Parliamentary finesse on both sides of the House. As Leader of the House he proposed that Mr. Jesse Collings's resolution should be taken at once, and that the debate on the address should then be adjourned; that the following day (Wednesday) should be given up to Mr. Woodall's Women's Suffrage Bill; and that on the next day the Government would introduce their Coercion Bill. Had this programme been accepted and the Government defeated on the latter measure, they would have been able to go out with the cry of "Law and order in Ireland," whilst the course of the debate would scarcely have failed to show the dissensions in the midst of the Liberal party on the Irish question. But this plan was not destined to succeed. Mr. Dillon at once rose, but had scarcely begun to speak when he was called to order by the Speaker, and resigned his place to Mr. Parnell, who opposed the interposition of a private member's bill (Mr. Woodall's) in the middle of the Address, on the ground that they should "continue the discussion of their reply to her Majesty's gracious speech in an orderly fashion, and with due reverence to the Throne." He thought that, if the discussion on Mr. J. Collings's amendment were not completed that night, the House would turn aside to the other question of coercion in

Ireland, and he "would ask the members returned by agricultural constituencies whether they would be carrying out the wishes of their constituents by allowing the Government to pass by the very important question of agriculture in order to consider measures of coercion." Sir W. Harcourt followed with the suggestion that Mr. J. Collings's amendment might be disposed of that evening, the other amendment on the following day, and that by this means, the Address having been got out of the way, the Government would be able to bring forward their proposals for Ireland on the day named. The Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed his willingness to adopt this course, but warmly defended himself from the suggestion thrown out by Mr. Parnell that the Government were endeavouring to get rid of the agricultural question raised by Mr. Collings. Mr. Gladstone expressed himself satisfied with the assurances of the Government, on the understanding that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal should be binding only for that and the following day; Mr. Jesse Collings adding his conviction that, so far as his friends were concerned, there would be no difficulty in bringing the discussion to a close that night. The adjourned debate on the Address was thereupon resumed, and Mr. Jesse Collings moved his amendment in the following terms: "But this House humbly expresses its regret that no measures are announced by her Majesty for the present relief of these classes, and especially for affording facilities to the agricultural labourers and others in the rural districts to obtain allotments and small holdings on equitable terms as to rent and security of tenure."

In order to appreciate the importance attached to the views expressed in this amendment by a certain section of the Radical party, it is necessary to go back to a meeting of the Allotments and Small Holdings Association, held at the Westminster Palace Hotel on the eve of the meeting of Parliament (Jan. 11). On that occasion Mr. Chamberlain made a noteworthy speech, in the course of which he declared that the condition of the agricultural labourers was the keynote to the solution of the whole Land question; and that it would be a breach of faith on the part of the Liberal party if they were not to deal at the earliest possible moment with the question, seeing that they had claimed and received support on account of these proposals. After a strongly worded attack upon the landowners, who, he admitted, were now awakening to a sense of their responsibilities, Mr. Chamberlain went on to say: "We are not going to allow the welfare of the labourer to be a matter of grace and favour. The interests of the whole country are largely involved in this question, and we are bound to give our principles the sanction of legislation; and I am convinced that no settlement is possible which does not afford facilities to all who require it to obtain the direct and independent interest in the land." Speaking approvingly of the bill drawn up by the Association, he explained its main principles

to be—(1) that the responsibility of dealing with this question should be thrown upon the local representative popular authorities, elected by all the ratepayers under the protection of the ballot; (2) that the powers to take land entrusted to these local authorities should be compulsory, the landlord having the right to compensation; and (3) that when the local authorities had decided to take land for any public purpose, they should be entitled to enter upon its possession at a fair price.

In supporting his resolution in the House of Commons Mr. J. Collings followed very much the line of argument adopted by his colleague, Mr. Chamberlain, at the Westminster Palace Hotel. He admitted that if every landlord were to offer allotments there would be no need for compulsion; but he did not wish to leave men to the mercy of voluntary effort. He maintained that with a peasant proprietary, poultry, butter, cheese, vegetables, and the like, requiring that minute industry which the farmer could not give, could be produced, and that the fifty millions sterling now spent on these articles imported from abroad would be spent in the country.

Mr. Chaplin, replying to Mr. Collings, characterised his arguments as unreasonable and inaccurate. He maintained that by the appointment of the Royal Commission on Trade Depression the Government had done a great deal towards a proper consideration of the question, and that the measure of local government which was promised in the Queen's Speech was another step in the direction of improving the condition of the agricultural labourer. He admitted that a reasonable allotment was of advantage, but denied that a small holding, as recommended by Mr. Arch in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Agriculture, would be of any avail. While strongly opposed to small freeholds, he was in favour of voluntary effort in providing allotments, which the Government, he said, had every desire to facilitate. Passing to the views expressed by Mr. Chamberlain on the subject of small holdings, which he severely criticised, he asserted that the Conservative party had no objection to a large increase in the number of landowners; and, while admitting the existence of defects in the Land Laws, he argued that it was ludicrous to hold that these defects were the cause of the present depression. He maintained, in conclusion, that an extended system of small holdings must of necessity lead to the imposition of protective duties, as was now the case in France, and quoted from the reports of inspectors appointed by the Commission on Agriculture in support of his contention that the system of peasant proprietary in other European countries had signally failed.

The Government having thus clearly expressed its views and intentions, anxiety was shown to learn Mr. Gladstone's attitude. He had in his manifesto and addresses so distinctly ruled this question out of the Liberal programme that up to

the last moment it seemed doubtful whether an abstract resolution of this nature would obtain his support. But the temptation of placing the Government in a minority on a side issue was too great to be resisted; and his duty to his party to place it in power on the first opportunity naturally outweighed in Mr. Gladstone's mind the objections to a course which under other circumstances he might have disapproved. Addressing himself at once to the practical issue involved in the resolution, Mr. Gladstone declined to be led into a discussion of agricultural depression or peasant proprietaries, which were not before the House, but dwelt on the evident fact that the Government had no measures whatever to offer for the relief of the labouring population. This could not be found either in the adjustment of local burdens or the sale of glebe farms. A great adjustment of local burdens was wanted, but not in the way suggested: "The readjustment that is wanted is the settlement of accounts with the landed interest, which for many years past has recommended and obtained these transfers from the rates to the Consolidated Fund, every shilling of which in the rural districts will ultimately go to nothing but to increase the rent. We are under no obligation to wait for the right hon. gentleman to give us his measures unless he assures us that his readjustment of local burdens is to be founded on principles altogether different from those upon which they have hitherto been based. I was astonished when I heard him gravely propose this measure for selling glebe land as anything approaching a remedy or an expedient for a remedy for the general condition of the agricultural labourer. There are certain portions of the clergy who hold glebe farms, and no doubt that portion has suffered extremely; and it may be a great object with them to sell their glebe lands. I am afraid this is a very bad time for the purpose, though I quite admit that good may come out of it."

Mr. Gladstone proceeded to ask whether there was not something between small holdings and allotments—such as pasture for a cow: "In Europe it is common for local authorities to hold land which shall be made available for the labouring rural population, and I cannot see why something of this kind, when we have good local government prevailing, should not be brought about in this country. The question of compulsion is a question on which the right hon. gentleman looks as if there were something wicked in the nature of it. But compulsion for public objects is recognised in principle. It may be that it may be found difficult to apply compulsion in the case of expropriations, or for the purpose of providing the labouring men with portions of the land. One thing I will say fearlessly, that you can have no compulsion for that purpose which is not consistent with perfect fairness and equity to individuals; but, subject to that condition, compulsion is a matter fit to be examined and con-

sidered by this House. I am inclined to believe that, with a good local authority and the judicious use of public aid on the safest basis as to security, much might be done short of compulsion; but I am by no means prepared to say that compulsion is to be shut out. If it is shut out in the views of the Government I will not consent to shut it out. To restore to the old local communities of this country something of that character of a community in which the common interests of the individual labourer may be so managed as to associate him with the soil in a manner much more effectual than that in which he is associated at present—these I take to be views which we ought to thank my hon. friend for having laid before the House, and I heartily hope we shall adopt his motion by a large majority.”

In his maiden speech Mr. Arch, the agricultural labourer, who had defeated Lord H. Bentinck in Norfolk, declared that his friends and fellows did not ask for borrowed funds. They did not ask for the land to be given them, and they had no desire to steal it. He wished to ask the House whether they did not think that the time had come when these thousands of industrious and willing workers should no longer be shut out from the soil, but should have the opportunity of gaining a fair foothold upon it, and of producing food for themselves and their country. Tens of thousands of acres of land were waiting for the hand of the workman, and what that House ought to aim at was this—to use every legitimate means to bring the land that cried for labour and the labourer together as soon as possible.

Up to this point, with the exception of a mild protest from Mr. Finch-Hatton, nothing had been said which indicated any divergence of opinion among the Liberals. Mr. Goschen, however, on rising at once put aside the sentimental arguments which had been advanced on behalf of the agricultural labourer, and demanded that the question should be looked at in a practical and businesslike manner. He warned the House that it was not sufficient to profess sympathy with an end unless they believed that the measures proposed would achieve it. Their duty was to see whether the scheme laid before them would hold water, and whether it would not rather retard than hasten the aim all must have in view. At the bottom of this motion lay the idea that the community must take up the task of acquiring and letting out land in small allotments; and, amid loud cheers from the Ministerialists, he congratulated Mr. Chamberlain on his success in transferring this point from the “unauthorised” to the “authorised programme,” along with Home Rule and the “Three F’s,” to which also the Liberal party had been converted within the last two days. For himself, he could not go through so rapid a conversion; and though he was strongly in favour of increasing the number of landed proprietors, he believed that this motion would raise false hopes and arrest the natural and spontaneous development of the system: “Any system under



which the ratepayers are to become the landlords will involve them in so large an expenditure and in so much liability that I doubt whether much will come of the proposals of the hon. member. My hon. friend spoke of the right of the labourers to the land. Then, are the local authorities to have no option in the matter? I ask, How will it be if the local authorities do not give effect to the notion that the labourers have a right to the land? It is not only a question of the rights of agricultural labourers but of the town artisans that is concerned. Are there not tens of thousands of artisans in the large towns who wish to have their tenements at a fair and equitable rent? And then, is the next step to be, when we pass from the fair and equitable rent for agricultural land, a fair and equitable rent for house property? Is it wise that the community should undertake this great task, which my right hon. and triumphant friend Mr. Chamberlain has called restoring the labourer to the land?"

Mr. Goschen then went on to show that the machinery would be uncommonly costly to the ratepayers, and would lead to much jobbery; in fact, it would be found so full of inconvenience and danger that he believed very little would come of it. As to the labourer's right to the land, he asked, was the town artisan's right to his house to be allowed? While declaring his firm intention to vote against the motion, he protested against being charged with want of sympathy for the agricultural labourer, and again denounced the motion as an innovation on the old Liberal creed.

After a speech from Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. A. Balfour said that the Government proposed that in the bill dealing with local government power should be given to the local authority to be constituted by that bill to deal with the question of allotments. It was the intention of the Government, and it always had been, to give those local bodies power to deal with this question. He, however, denied that a *primâ facie* case had been made out to justify the compulsory creation of small tenancies, and greatly questioned the practical utility of legislation such as that proposed.

Mr. Chamberlain's attitude upon this question throughout the previous autumn had been no less important than Mr. Goschen's; and he had gone further than any of his former colleagues in urging the advantages which would accrue to the advanced Liberal party from the adoption of a distinctive land and labour policy. He had anticipated without misgiving the moment when the Whigs and Radicals would find themselves opposed upon the agricultural question, and he had shown his belief in the desire of the newly enfranchised rural voters to inaugurate some radical change in their position. For reasons already explained Mr. Gladstone, whilst declining to follow Mr. Chamberlain's counsel, or to put forward his views as those adopted by the Liberal party as a whole, had never formally

repudiated them, nor exposed the economic fallacy which underlay them. It was, therefore, with some show of reason that in opening his speech in this debate Mr. Chamberlain took objection to Mr. Goschen's assertion that the question of allotments had not formed part of the authorised Liberal programme. As for Mr. Balfour's promise that the Government were prepared to take up the subject, whilst congratulating Mr. Collings upon having so rapidly converted them to his views, he expressed his scepticism as to the outcome of so complete a change of front on the part of the Conservative landowners. After what had taken place, moreover, during the election campaign, the Liberal party were bound to take up the question, and from a point of view wholly opposed to that occupied by the Government. "We support," he said, "a hostile amendment, in the first place because the condition and claims of the agricultural labourers constitute one of the great questions raised at the last election, and because it is our bounden duty to uphold those claims in Parliament; and in the second place because we have no confidence that the Government will either do justice to the agricultural labourers or to any question which they may have to deal with."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer in reply defended the Government from the charge of having come to a hasty or ill-considered conclusion. Mr. Balfour's statement as to the intention of the Government to invest local authorities with powers to facilitate the granting of allotments to the labouring classes was not a new one, although there were points connected with that important question of compulsion to which he could not hold out for a moment that the Government would be able to give their adherence. The motion was, he contended, not a move on behalf of the agricultural labourer, but was intended to turn the present Government out of office:—

"I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that if the result of this division should be unfavourable to her Majesty's Government we shall accept that decision without regret. We assumed office reluctantly, and we shall leave it willingly, as soon as we are assured that we do not possess the support of this House. But the success of this motion will have another and graver result than the defeat of her Majesty's Government. It will not only be a defeat of her Majesty's Government, but will also be a defeat of the policy which her Majesty's Government have announced they believe it to be their duty to pursue with reference to Ireland. . . . But I venture to say this—if this motion succeeds, and places in office a right hon. gentleman who only on Thursday last made a speech in this House full of the vaguest possibilities with reference to the future connection between these two kingdoms, then, however much they may be satisfied with their work of this evening, yet I earnestly and sincerely press hon. members who value that legislative union as much as we

do to think twice and thrice before, in their sincere desire to promote the interests of the agricultural labourer by this vague and unnecessary and untimely motion, they commit the future of this country to the gravest dangers that ever awaited the people of England."

The debate was closed by a speech from Lord Hartington, who, as Sir M. Hicks-Beach had anticipated, devoted himself to refuting Mr. Chamberlain's arguments, and to defining still more clearly the line of divergence between the two sections of the Liberal party. Lord Hartington declared himself bound in consistency with his speeches during the election campaign to vote against the resolution. He expressed his agreement with much that had fallen from Mr. Goschen; but he based his own opposition on narrower and somewhat different grounds: "I agree with what was said by Mr. Chamberlain when he stated that this question was not excluded from the policy laid before the country by the member for Midlothian. Certainly I have never treated it as excluded. I have never considered it as excluded. But what I have also not understood until this evening is that it was intended that the Liberal party should be invited on the first moment of assembling to lay down a vague, wide declaration establishing principles without having under consideration the details of the measure by which these principles are to be carried out, or the character of the authorities to whom their execution is to be entrusted. That is the reason why I find myself unable to support and, indeed, obliged to oppose the motion. I thought that it raised too great hopes—I trust not false hopes—in the minds of the agricultural labourers of this country. I trust that the condition of the labouring classes has within recent years—I am not speaking of the last year or two—been greatly improved. I believe that the wages of the agricultural labourers have been increased, that their standard of living has improved, and that their houses even have also been improved. And what has all this improvement been due to? It has been due to the increased spirit of independence, the increased intelligence and power of combination which have been exercised by those agricultural labourers in the same way as the other labouring classes throughout the country have been able to improve their condition."

The division was then taken, when there appeared (including tellers) 331 for Mr. Jesse Collings's amendment and 252 against, or a majority of 79 against the Government, made up of 257 Liberals, English, Scotch, and Welsh, and 74 Irish Nationalists. On the other hand, 18 Liberals, including Lord Hartington, Sir Henry James, Mr. Goschen, Mr. Courtney, and Sir John Lubbock, voted against the resolution. The Liberal absentees, moreover, numbered 76, and included men of views so diverse as those of Mr. Bright, Sir Thos. Acland, Mr. J. Cowen, Mr. Brand, Sir J. Ramsden, and Mr. C. P. Villiers. The defeat of the Government was, however, recognised as final and complete, and



he only question which arose in the public mind was to what extent Mr. Gladstone would acknowledge the liabilities he had incurred towards Mr. Parnell and his followers. A few, it is true, attempted to argue that the issue upon which the division had been taken was not a vital one; and that, were subtraction made of the Irish vote, the majority would have been too small to justify a change of Administration. To this it was, however, answered that the Ministry having stated its intention with regard to Ireland, the tacit alliance which may have bound Mr. Parnell to Lord Salisbury was finally dissolved, and the former had only been true to the preference he had expressed some time previously of co-operating with the Liberal rather than with the Conservative party. The tactics of the Government in accepting defeat upon the issue of "Three acres and a cow," without having extracted from Mr. Gladstone any hint as to his Irish policy, was keenly canvassed. On the one hand it was said that Lord Salisbury and his Cabinet, apprehending the necessity of some immediate settlement of the Irish question, desired to see it undertaken by Mr. Gladstone. If the method proposed were one upon which both parties could agree, a vexatious question might be got rid of for a generation; if, on the other hand, Mr. Gladstone should propose a drastic remedy for Irish ills, the Conservatives might reasonably expect so serious a division in the Liberal party that their return to power could not long be delayed.

Public opinion, as expressed through the newspapers, was also on the side of the resignation of the Cabinet; and the prompt decision of the Cabinet on this point met with general approval, but the prospect before the Liberals was diversely judged. The *Standard*, anticipating the refusal of Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen to form part of the Administration, thought that Mr. Gladstone would appeal to the younger men of his party to assist him in his crusade on behalf of the Irish Separatists: "The political outlook is gloomy in the extreme. Either England and Ireland will be torn apart, or we shall witness a succession of short-lived Administrations, a consequent weakening of the action of the Executive both at home and abroad, and a shock to representative institutions that will leave its trace for many a day." The *Daily News*, of which the editorship had just changed hands, took just the opposite point of view, and declared that Mr. Gladstone would be sent for and invited to return to the office he quitted under peculiar circumstances that still left him in supreme power, "broad based upon the people's will." The *Daily Telegraph*, whilst not doubting that Mr. Gladstone would cheerfully assume the heritage of a situation he had so powerfully helped to create, anticipated that the differences prevailing in the Liberal ranks rendered the future more than usually obscure. The *Times* presented with great distinctness the alternative which Mr. Gladstone had to face, asking whether he was prepared "—

proclaim the National League, to put down boycotting, to restore the authority of the law, and to defend personal liberties and proprietary rights, and to press forward legislation for these purposes with all the strength of the Government? If he does he will have his allies of last night arrayed against him. If he does not, is it possible he can retain the allegiance and secure the co-operation in public affairs of those Liberals, from Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen down to the least conspicuous member of the House of Commons, who still set the interests and honour of the country above considerations of loss or gain."

On the outgoing Ministry the verdict was almost unanimously favourable, even the Radical organs admitting that its brief record was bright and deserving of high commendation. Lord Salisbury had taken the seals of the Foreign Office at a moment of extraordinary perplexity, and had succeeded rapidly in smoothing over the difficulties with Russia arising out of the Afghan frontier, in establishing more friendly relations with Germany, and in some degree assuaging the bitter hostility of France. In the Balkan Peninsula, in face of an unexpected crisis, he had assumed the position of protector of the rising nationalities without openly arousing the ill-will of either Russia or Austria. Lord Carnarvon's attempt to govern Ireland on the principles of justice and conciliation would have succeeded better had his hands been less fettered by the pressure of the reactionary Conservatives in England and the persistent opposition of the National League in Ireland. In spite of these drawbacks, he left behind him the reputation of a high-principled statesman animated by the single idea of bringing the two countries into harmony and to a mutual respect.

The formalities in connection with the resignation of Lord Salisbury's Ministry were not delayed; the rumours of a coalition Cabinet were speedily disposed of, and the Queen, following the accustomed rule, forthwith sent for Mr. Gladstone, and entrusted him with the formation of an Administration.

## CHAPTER II.

Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet—Mr. John Morley made Secretary for Ireland—The Attitude of the Whigs—Apportionment of Offices—Mr. Chamberlain accepts Office - Mr. Morley at Newcastle—The London Riots—Lord R. Churchill and Lord Salisbury on the Conservative Policy—Lord Hartington at the Eighty Club - Resolution in the House of Commons to Abolish the House of Lords; to Disestablish the Church in Wales and Scotland—The Railway Traffic Bill—The Estimates—The Budget—The Crofters' Bill—Foreign Affairs.

MR. GLADSTONE at once set himself to carry out the task of forming a Government, of which the aim would be the attainment of that object he had so persistently had in view, the reconciliation of Ireland and England. He had for so long directed the policy of the Empire that he might well have been spared the charges of

vulgar ambition and power-seeking which were so freely brought against him; and it may be fairly supposed that his desire to again take up the burden of office sprang from the feeling of disappointment at the outcome of his past legislation for the removal of Irish grievances. The Irish Church Bill, the Irish Land Bill, with its modifications and extensions, and, finally, the extension of the Irish franchise, had at the time been expected to produce goodwill and contentment among the Irish people. But these peace-offerings from Great Britain had either come too late to conciliate the disaffected, or had been regarded as mere stepping-stones to that complete independence which the Irish leaders assured their followers was now within their reach. No one could have been better aware of the futility and ill-success of his previous concessions to Irish feeling than was Mr. Gladstone himself; and it was therefore the more incumbent on him not to shrink from a final attempt to realise the hopes he had entertained when he first proposed the disestablishment of the Irish Church.

Mr. Gladstone's primary consideration was on what basis he could form an Administration which would afford the best hope of carrying out an Irish policy. The result of the general elections had not only expressed in clear terms the wishes, as far as met the eye, of five-sixths of the electors of Ireland, but had placed in the hands of the Irish Nationalist leader, Mr. Parnell, the key of the position. The defection of the twenty Whigs had been unavailing to avert the defeat of the Conservatives, and their reconciliation to the bulk of the party would not compensate for the certain hostility of the eighty-five Parnellites in the event of the Irish demands being ignored. On the simplest grounds of expediency, if higher considerations had not impelled him, Mr. Gladstone was bound to accept the alliance of those by whose aid he had been returned to power, rather than to make concessions to those who by their vote had supported his opponents. That the former thought was predominant in his mind from the first moment was obvious by the line he adopted in framing his Cabinet. On the morrow of the day on which he undertook the formation of an Administration (Feb. 1) it was announced that the Irish Secretaryship, with a seat in the Cabinet, had been assigned to Mr. John Morley. Elected to Parliament for the first time in 1883 at a bye-election for Newcastle-on-Tyne, Mr. Morley had taken his place among the Radical members below the gangway, giving a discriminating support to Mr. Gladstone's Government, in contrast with the indiscriminating opposition offered by his Radical colleague, Mr. Joseph Cowen. Mr. Morley, however, although new to the House of Commons, was in no sense new to political life. As an author, a critic, and a journalist, he had acquired a reputation and exercised an influence which were recognised in every political circle. *His speeches in the House had been few, but*

weighty, and it was felt even by those of his friends who had regretted his renouncing a literary for a political career that his chances of success were hopeful. Few, if any, supposed that he would take his place in the Cabinet at the very outset of his career, or that to so outspoken and consistent a supporter of a radical change in the administration of Ireland would be confided the special charge of that department. In his speech at Chelmsford, to which reference was made in the preceding chapter, Mr. Morley had taken a view of English duties and responsibilities in strong contrast with the vague generalities indulged in by Mr. Childers and other Liberal speakers. Mr. Gladstone's selection was consequently regarded as finally indicative of his intended policy towards Ireland; and although in some quarters it was argued that Mr. Parnell should be entrusted with responsibilities to the weight of which he had so largely contributed, there was, nevertheless, a general approval of the idea that the task of reconciling Ireland should be left to those who had in past times done so much to estrange her. Another consideration which may have weighed with Mr. Gladstone in bringing Mr. John Morley so prominently forward was his need to have in the midst of the Radical section a counterpoise to Mr. Chamberlain. The withdrawal of Sir Charles Dilke from political life might at any moment have left the undisputed leadership of the advanced Liberals in the hands of a statesman who in the course of a successful career had estranged many colleagues, and to whom were attributed economic views wholly at variance with those of the school to which Mr. Gladstone belonged. On financial questions Mr. Morley was beyond suspicion of making concession to sentimental theories or political expediency. The biographer of Cobden was thoroughly impressed with the soundness of his master's views on economical questions, and there was no fear that he would lack the courage of his opinions.

The announcement of Mr. John Morley's appointment as Irish Secretary was followed almost at once by the assertion that Lord Spencer, who for five years had administered the Coercion Laws as Irish Viceroy, had expressed his adherence to Mr. Gladstone's new policy, which was supposed to include the concession of a separate Irish Parliament. On the other hand, the rumour of Lord Hartington's refusal to join the Administration almost as promptly transpired. Mr. Gladstone, however, was not disposed to part with a colleague of so long standing without an effort, and for some days negotiations proceeded which had for their object the inclusion of the leaders of the Whig party, Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, and Sir Henry James. To the last-named both the Lord Chancellorship and the Home Secretaryship were successively offered, but without result. The negotiations with Mr. Chamberlain *were likewise protracted* for some time, for reasons which were

not so clearly explained either at the time or subsequently. On the one hand, it was said that whilst Mr. Chamberlain was anxious for the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, he was offered the First Lordship of the Admiralty, although he finally appeared in the list submitted to the Queen as President of the Local Government Board. On the other hand, it was asserted in the *Birmingham Daily Post*, Mr. Chamberlain's own organ, that that gentleman required more specific assurances before joining the Cabinet; and that until he was given to believe that the Ministerial policy was to be one of inquiry and examination, and not one based on the idea of separate Parliaments, he declined to accept any office. Similar assurances were, it was said, required by and given to Mr. G. O. Trevelyan, who was appointed Secretary of State for Scotland. The other Cabinet offices were distributed for the most part amongst the members of Mr. Gladstone's previous Ministry, and the shifting from one office gave rise to more criticism than the selection of the office-holders. Sir William Harcourt as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Childers as Home Secretary, was a reversal of their previous respective positions which produced a smile, but in their respective offices in the former Administration neither had fulfilled the anticipations of his more hopeful friends, and Mr. Childers's career as Chancellor of the Exchequer had been especially tame and disappointing. On the other hand, the substitution of the Earl of Rosebery at the Foreign Office for the veteran Earl Granville, who went to the Colonial Office, was regarded with general satisfaction. Lord Spencer became President of the Council; Sir Farrer Herschell, Lord Chancellor; the Marquess of Ripon, First Lord of the Admiralty; Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Secretary for War; and Mr. Mundella entered the Cabinet for the first time as President of the Board of Trade. Outside the Cabinet the appointment of Mr. C. Russell, Q.C., as Attorney-General, whilst a fitting recognition of his position at the Bar and his powers as an advocate, was rather regarded as acknowledgment of the claims of the ablest supporter of Home Rule; and the choice of Mr. Jesse Collings as Secretary to the Local Government Board was a reward for the success of his resolution in the House of Commons, by which Mr. Gladstone was placed in power. Lord Northbrook, the Earl of Derby, Lord Selborne, Lord Carlingford, Sir Charles Dilke, and Mr. Forster were not included in the new arrangement of offices; and after a slight delay the Earl of Aberdeen was fixed upon as the new Viceroy for Ireland. Amongst those who held office for the first time were Mr. Bryce, as Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Horace Davey, as Solicitor-General, both of whom were Radicals, though of different shades; and Mr. Heneage as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Mr. Wodehouse as Under-Secretary for the Colonies, both Whigs by descent and conviction. *But most noteworthy of all among the minor of the*



Home Office appointments was that of Mr. Henry Broadhurst as Under-Secretary, as the first instance of a working-man (he had started in life as a stonemason) being introduced into an Administration. Taken as a whole, Mr. Gladstone's new Administration, apart from the special significance of Mr. John Morley's appointment, resembled the old one in most respects, except that its leaning towards Radicalism was more strongly accentuated. It was curious, however, that, in an Administration of which the latest watchword was to be Home Rule for Wales and Scotland as well as for Ireland, so large proportion of offices were assigned to Scotchmen or to representatives of Scotch constituencies, suggesting that in the Prime Minister's mind the kingdom of the Union which was the one most interested in the harmonious concert of all was least capable of governing itself or its neighbours.

The opinions of the press on the Gladstone-Morley Government, as it was called, were only agreed upon the difficulties of the task which the session would probably develop. The *Times* from the first took the line of opposing to the extent of its power the policy which with accuracy it anticipated Mr. Gladstone would adopt, and at the very outset warned him of the dangers he would incur. "Mr. Gladstone's Government," it wrote, "enters upon office with omens of weakness such as have never overshadowed any Administration since Lord John Russell's, after Lord Palmerston's ejection. Even then there did not exist outside of the Cabinet any large and formidable representation of Liberal distrust and Liberal discontent. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, has now to reflect not only on the loss of official aid and personal influence in which his recent policy has involved him, but has to be prepared for active resistance on the part of his former colleagues and followers, if his project should be developed, as is feared, in a dangerous direction."

On the following day (Feb. 3) the same journal expressed its views on Mr. Morley's appointment at greater length, and it urged the dissentient Liberals—to whom the title of "Unionists" had not yet been given—to express their views without delay.

"It would be impossible," said the *Times*, "to overestimate the political significance of the selection of Mr. Morley, remarkable as it is in many aspects. The Irish policy of the new Cabinet is thus proclaimed to be a Home Rule policy in the largest sense, and Mr. Morley is chosen by the leader of the Liberal party to undertake the task of carrying it through. Mr. Morley is a brilliant man of letters, the master of an admirable style, and since he has engaged in active political life he has won with remarkable rapidity a commanding influence in the Radical party, though rather by his platform speeches than by his position in the House of Commons. But he has yet to prove that he has the stuff in him of which great administrators are made, and it is a dangerous experiment to set him to try his

prentice hand upon the Irish difficulty. Mr. Morley's policy is well known, and he is not the man to disavow in office the principles he has advocated in opposition. All supporters of the Union, whether they call themselves Liberals or Conservatives, will be entitled and, indeed, bound to challenge the conduct of these distinguished politicians by contesting the seats they will vacate when they formally accept office under Mr. Gladstone." And again, echoing the question posed in its columns by "An Old Whig," and referring to the decisive proof afforded of Mr. Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule, and the acceptance of office by Lord Spencer, Mr. Trevelyan, and Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, it asked: "What faith can any longer be placed in English statesmen?"

The *Daily News* was of opinion that the list of names submitted to the Queen for approval constituted a Ministry not less strong in some respects than that which in 1868 was hailed as the strongest Ministry of modern times. The *News* regarded Mr. Morley's reward as much a testimony to the judgment and discrimination of the House of Commons as a tribute to a character in which was to be found "a rare combination of modesty and ability." The *Standard's* estimate of the new Chief Secretary was very different: "Mr. John Morley has shown himself an active politician of the Caucus stamp; but he has never given any evidence of sound judgment or capacity in the management of affairs. He steps at a bound from the seats below the gangway to the Treasury bench. His inclusion in the ranks of the Cabinet was an inevitable concession to the Radical claims. But it is certainly unfortunate that an Administration so awkwardly compromised by the relations of its chief and other of its leading members with the Home Rule demand should be completed by the accession of a politician who comes almost fresh from preaching the doctrine that Englishmen ought to close their eyes to the future of the United Kingdom because it is in Mr. Parnell's power for the moment to make things unpleasant in Parliament."

And on a subsequent occasion, referring to the general composition of the Cabinet, it wrote: "The choice of Lord Rosebery as Foreign Secretary is, unquestionably, the best selection of the whole. Sir William Harcourt's assumption of so important an office is likely to create as much consternation in the City as his elevation to the Lord Chancellorship would have excited in Lincoln's Inn. The appointment of Mr. Morley is perhaps the most remarkable of all, and is likely to be canvassed on all sides with much warmth. In favour of Mr. Morley are his general capacity, his proved literary talent, and his ability as a speaker in the House of Commons. Against him must be set his total want of administrative experience. He has been a *littérateur* and a man of the closet all his life; has never worked at a profession, held a brief, taken any share in local business, or whetted his common-sense in the transactions of trade and commerce,



He has written an essay upon compromise, though in political life he has shown very little of its spirit. For the present he must be regarded as a purely doctrinaire politician, who has given no evidence of his fitness to deal with practical affairs. So far as the construction of his new Government has gone, Mr. Gladstone may be congratulated on the accomplishment of a task of a peculiar and extremely trying character."

The *Daily Telegraph*, whilst as strongly opposed to separation as the *Times*, generously appreciated the courage of the Irish Secretary: "Mr. Morley is about to undertake a task which—except on the assumption that complete legislative independence is to be granted to Ireland—he has himself described as almost desperate. His acceptance, therefore, of the post to which he has been appointed is in his case a proof of political courage which few men beside himself are in a position to give. He volunteers not only for what is virtually a forlorn hope, but for what he himself has acknowledged to be such. We heartily wish him success, but without venturing to anticipate it for him."

The English provincial organs of the various shades of Liberalism were more disposed to encourage the Government policy than to prophesy its success. "If," wrote the *Manchester Guardian*, "Mr. Gladstone carries with him Mr. Trevelyan, Lord Granville, and, above all, Lord Spencer, that is at once a signal tribute of confidence in his Irish policy and a substantial guarantee to those who desire to see this matter dealt with on a level far above party politics, that national interests will be held as supreme in the councils of the Ministry. We may as well say at once that we do not believe that the English people are prepared for a constitutional revolution. We are not going to pull down our constitution to please any one; and if the demands of Mr. Parnell and his followers can be satisfied on no other terms, we fear they must remain for an indefinite period unsatisfied."

The *Leeds Mercury*, which at more than one important juncture had shown itself to be correctly inspired as to what was passing in Mr. Gladstone's mind, declared: "Mr. Morley will be placed in a position of extreme importance and very great difficulty. That he will bring to the performance of his duties not only great ability, but a strong sympathy with the people of Ireland, and with their legitimate as opposed to their unreasonable aspirations, need not be said. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that Mr. Morley's appointment would mean that the strong views he is known to hold as to the manner in which the Irish question ought to be dealt with had received the approval of the new Government. It cannot be stated too clearly or too emphatically that no plan has as yet been drawn up for dealing with the Irish question. Whenever a bill upon the subject is brought in, it will be the work not of any one man but of the Cabinet as a whole."

The *Sheffield Independent*, an advanced Radical paper, paid a warm tribute to Mr. Morley's character, pointing out that throughout the whole of his public life as author, journalist, and politician he had earnestly advocated the redress of Irish grievances and the concession to Ireland of large measures of local self-government. In spite of this, the *Independent* added, "some of the Parnellite organs are beginning to carp and cavil at his appointment. It is impossible to satisfy Parnellism, as Mr. Morley will find."

The *Birmingham Post*, writing whilst the negotiations with the chief by whom its articles were frequently inspired were still going on, showed in plain words the dangers which lay ahead of a Minister bent upon giving way to Mr. Parnell's demands. It said: "The last reported appointment—that of Mr. John Morley to the Irish Chief Secretaryship—if it be true, will cause something like a shiver, for it is impossible to forget the speech in which Mr. Morley lately declared practically for Home Rule, and seemed, at the same time, to look forward to separation as by no means an unmixed evil. We ventured, in commenting on Mr. Morley's speech, to suggest that he must have had large reserves in his mind as regards Irish questions; and we revert to this impression as affording the requisite explanation of his acceptance of office—and of this particular office—in a Cabinet which includes several members, probably a majority, who are strongly pledged against an independent Irish Parliament. The Ministerial policy is, so they say, to be a policy of inquiry and examination. If Ministers are going with 'open minds' into the consideration of that question there is very serious trouble before them, and probably no long lease of official life. But we have no sort of belief that the unity of the kingdom is to be regarded by the Cabinet as an open question."

The various offices having been filled, it was necessary to adjourn Parliament pending the re-election of the new Ministers, a custom of which the futility and drawbacks were widely felt and condemned on the present occasion. These re-elections, however, afforded the newly appointed Ministers an opportunity of stating publicly the circumstances under which they had taken office. Mr. Gladstone, in his short address to the electors of Midlothian, said that he saw no cause to modify any leading declarations of his last address, "on pending subjects of British legislation, or on the basis and the necessary limits of a policy for Ireland." And he continued:—

"I had earnestly hoped that the late Government might have been enabled to make proposals adequate to the needs of the sister island, but at the moment when an issue altogether separate put an end to the existence of that Ministry it had become evident that *this hope must be abandoned*.


"*There were three great Irish questions demanding our care—social order, the settlement of the Land question, and a widely*

prevalent desire for self-government, extending beyond what is felt in Great Britain as to local affairs, but necessarily subject in all respects to the law of Imperial unity. It was made plain last week that, while all ideas of local government for Ireland receded farther and farther into the distance, and while on this very ground it was hardly possible to hope for any enlarged handling of the Land question, the one broad proposal with which Parliament was to be invited to deal was a renewal of special and restrictive provisions for the criminal law of Ireland. This was to be the question of the hour; perhaps the work of the session.

“It will be among the very first duties of the new Government to use its official opportunities for forming such an estimate as only a Ministry can form of the social state of Ireland, especially with regard to crime, to the fulfilment of contracts, to the pressure of low prices upon agriculture, and to personal liberty of action. The course of policy as a whole cannot be considered without reference to this examination; but beyond all doubt the hope and purpose of the new Government in taking office is to examine carefully whether it is not practicable to try some other method of meeting the present case of Ireland and ministering to its wants, both social and political—some method more safe and more effectual, going nearer to the source and seat of the mischief, and offering more promise of stability than the method of separate and restrictive criminal legislation.

“To this task we shall address ourselves under a profound sense of the responsibility which, in this free country, weighs upon the people of the three kingdoms, but which is especially concentrated upon the advisers of the Crown. Where so many risks and obstacles beset the path we shall not lightly count upon a favourable issue; but we have no doubt as to the great principles which should guide our course, and we shall draw comfort from the belief that we are engaged in a work of peace.”

On the same day (Feb. 5) Mr. Chamberlain issued his address to the electors of West Birmingham, in which, referring to the office to which he had been appointed, he expressed the hope of finding an opportunity to promote and extend the system of local self-government; and on this question he expressed his belief that he was more in sympathy with his present colleagues than with those Liberals who had found themselves unable to give Mr. Gladstone their support. “The result of the general election in Ireland,” he went on to say, “has made it imperative that attention should immediately be called to the state of that country, and to the remedies for what is unsatisfactory in its condition. I am ready to give an unprejudiced consideration to the claims and wishes of the majority of the *Irish people* as formulated by their elected representatives. I *am prepared to support any just and reasonable proposal for a final settlement in accordance with the special necessities of the*



case of the Land and Education questions. In connection with these subjects I am convinced that it will be necessary to concede to the Irish people much more extended control of their own domestic business; but I appeal to my recent speeches, both before and after the election, as evidence of my firm intention to consent to no plan which will not sufficiently guarantee the continued supremacy of the Crown in that country and the integrity of the Empire."

Mr. Morley only said that he had felt it his duty not to shrink from "a task, however arduous, which was pressed upon me as a public duty by the illustrious statesman who is again at the head of our national affairs." The majority of the new members, however, had too recently expressed themselves either altogether against Home Rule in any form or in such ambiguous words as to the method of its adoption, that in most cases in their addresses to their constituents they avoided as far as possible any allusion to so delicate a subject. Few were able, like the Attorney-General, Mr. C. Russell, to say that in his opinion, "under conditions which secured the supremacy of the Crown and of the Imperial Parliament, Irishmen might be entrusted with the power of dealing on Irish soil with Irish questions." The greater number, like Mr. Mundella and Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, had to "seek for grace," as they expressed it, and were lucky enough to find it attached to the patents or portfolios of their respective offices.

A few of the new Ministers were exposed to the ordeal of a contest when offering themselves for re-election, and of such Mr. Morley's at Newcastle-on-Tyne was not only the most important in itself, but by its affording the Chief Secretary an opportunity of expounding his own views, and inferentially those of the Cabinet of which he was so conspicuous a member. The constituency which he represented and the hold he had upon its allegiance were alike anomalous. His colleague in its representation was Mr. Joseph Cowen, who enjoyed great local popularity and wielded a powerful influence through his newspaper, the *Newcastle Chronicle*, and by his almost unrivalled powers as an orator. An ardent and consistent Home Ruler long before the question became one of practical politics, at the last general election he had been suspected of being only lukewarm in the support of his colleague, not from any waning sympathy with Radicalism, but from his increasing dislike to Mr. Gladstone and his official followers. His repeated return at the head of the poll, moreover, proved that Mr. Cowen's independent attitude was duly appreciated by a large body of the Tyneside electors; and although on previous occasions Mr. Morley had secured his seat, and now, on the question of Irish Home Rule, Mr. Cowen was at one with him, it was possible that *on the eve of a new departure in Irish politics the very fervour of the resident Irish electors in his cause might provoke the hostility of the still larger proportion of the*

English Liberals. Mr. Morley's canvass was therefore watched with great interest. In his first speech (Feb. 8) he explained in very clear terms the meaning which underlay his acceptance of office. After passing in review the policy of the late Government, Mr. Morley continued: "Lord Salisbury's Government, after an exhibition of hesitancy, of irresolution, and of vacillation which is, I undertake to say, in affairs of such concern and moment, almost without parallel, had been driven to avow that they could not extricate themselves from what Lord Carnarvon had called a 'miserable habit,' and that they had nothing to say, not one word to say, in the direction of a 'more wholesome and better solution.' Was it to be thought of, was it to be endured, would you have forgiven us if we had allowed Parliament to be dragged once more into the fever and fury of coercion debates without having a single chance of considering an alternative policy? Here was a new Parliament. Here, for the first time, was the voice of the English democracy able to make itself heard. Was it to be endured and was it to be thought of that the first message from the English democracy to their fellow-subjects in Ireland was to be the old sanguinary impotent message that has landed us in our present troubles and griefs? No; it was and it is our bounden duty, the duty of the Liberal party, if our principles and our conditions are of any value, if we are not playing a mere game—it was and it is our bounden duty to insist that we should not drift back into the old waters of bitterness and affliction without a frank, a prompt, and an earnest effort to find out and to frame some new plan and some better way."

Mr. Morley's opponent, Mr. Hamond, in his election address had announced his adherence to Lord Salisbury's policy of persistency—in other words, to a policy of coercion, and this gave Mr. Morley an opportunity of describing what that policy really meant. "In your coercion," he said, "if it is to be effective, you must put down public meetings, you must lock up disagreeable speakers, you must regulate disagreeable newspapers, you must suppress books and pamphlets, you must search men's houses for arms, you must suppress the Irish representation. I do not deny that that could be done, but it cannot be done for nothing. If you use remedies of that kind you will have to pay the price. You will instantly have the whole island honeycombed by secret societies; a secret press will pour out a furtive poison far more deadly and virulent than any that is now poured out; you will have midnight drillings; you will be very fortunate if you do not have passive resistance against the collection of taxes and the payment of rent. The money that is now going to the open purposes of the League will then go to the *more execrable* purposes of dynamite. At the end of all this *black confusion* your last state will be worse than your first. You will be driven then by force of opinion—the opinion of the



whole civilised world—to try that policy of conciliation which we ask you to try now.”

Declining to state what the details of the Ministerial bill would be, Mr. Morley declared that Mr. Gladstone's Government would not content itself “merely with what is called the restoration of order.” It would be their aim to build up such a social state that order would be based upon the affections of the people. He recognised the existence both in Ireland and in America of a sound and an unsound element among the Irish, but he did not believe it to be “beyond the reach of the genius of English statesmanship and the fortitude of English citizenship to set up a system which shall draw out the sting even from the hostility of those who are opposing us across the Atlantic. What the Irish are our institutions and our government have made them.” In expressing his sympathy with the tenantry, Mr. Morley was careful to express at the same time his sympathy with the landlords who had been reduced to dire distress, arising from the mischievous state of things for which they were not personally responsible; and he argued that no settlement of the Irish question would be satisfactory which omitted one single claim that could be made on English statesmanship. In a subsequent address (Feb. 11), after an absence of four-and-twenty hours at Dublin, Mr. Morley reiterated the assurance that, although he desired to enlarge Home Rule for Ireland, the separation of Ireland from England would be a disgrace to the one and a disaster to the other. His arguments and eloquence prevailed, and by the enormous majority of 2,661 votes over his Conservative opponent he was returned to Parliament to carry out a policy of conciliation.

Meanwhile the advent to office of the new Government had been marked by riots in London, more serious and destructive than any which had occurred during the previous half-century. A meeting of the unemployed had been called in Trafalgar Square (Feb. 8), and had been largely attended by decent men, chiefly belonging to the building trades, of whom there were many out of work in consequence of the long-continued frost, and the natural results of over-speculation among the master builders and building societies. At another corner of the square the “Revolutionary Social Democratic League” was holding a meeting and listening to inflammatory speeches by Messrs. Hyndman, Champion, Burns, and others. Their listeners were told that five hundred determined men would soon bring about a social change, that in France capitalists' heads decorated the lamp-posts, that the wanters were many and the wealthy few, and that the League would not shrink from revolution, &c. An attack was next made on the platform where the speakers of the other meeting were addressing *their* hearers, asking for work and *fair trade*; and in a few minutes “the unemployed,” or at least *the quieter among them*, dispersed. The Social Democrats, how-



ever, formed a procession, which was speedily joined by the rougher elements of the population, and as they marched up Pall Mall and St. James's Street began throwing stones and breaking the windows of the principal club houses. On arriving in Piccadilly without any attempt on the part of the police to restore order, they began pillaging and wrecking shops, and finally reached Hyde Park, where from the steps of the Achilles statue further speeches (in a restraining tone, as was afterwards averred) were made by the leaders. The mob then set off for South Audley Street, where they continued the work commenced in Piccadilly, and marched wrecking shops and destroying or scattering their contents. They then turned eastward down Oxford Street, where a police superintendent (Thompson), on his own responsibility, hurried up a small body of constables, threw them in a line across the street, and in a few minutes the mob was broken up and dispersed quietly. On the next day there were rumours that a renewal of the rioting might be expected; but beyond the assembling of knots of roughs in Trafalgar Square, speedily broken up by the police, nothing happened. On the third day, however (Feb. 10), a panic seized upon the West-End of London. Telegrams were received by the police that mobs of the unemployed were marching from Deptford, Greenwich, and the waterside places where trade was more than usually slack, and the police, without waiting to ascertain the truth of these rumours, hurriedly sent notice to the shopkeepers to take precautions. The Bank of England retained its guard of soldiers, usually dismissed in the daytime; shops were closed at midday, and in many streets were carefully barricaded and boarded. Nothing happened beyond a few cases of stone-throwing and a small gathering in Cumberland Market, and after a night of anxiety and suspense things resumed their ordinary course. The outcry against the police was loud and persistent. Damage to the extent of 50,000*l.* had been done, business had been almost wholly suspended for the greater part of three days, because no foresight had been displayed, and large groups of men, many of whom were known to belong to the "dangerous classes," had been allowed to assemble and riot through the richest thoroughfares without the least interference. Mr. Childers had only been installed in the Home Office a few hours before the outbreak; and so defective were the arrangements for keeping the Home Office acquainted with what was passing, that it was not until after the mob had been dispersed by the spirited action of a subordinate official that any tidings of what had taken place reached Whitehall. Parliament was not sitting at the time, having adjourned to allow the new Ministers to be re-elected, so that public feeling had to make itself known through the press, *with the necessary result of being unchecked by any sense of responsibility.* At first it seemed that Mr. Childers would be *expected to bear the whole brunt of the reproaches heaped upon*

the police, but the promptness with which it was announced that the Government intended to prosecute Mr. Hyndman and his associates silenced, in some degree, the attacks upon the Home Secretary, and the defective organisation of the Metropolitan police became the subject of severe criticisms. Without awaiting the meeting of Parliament Mr. Childers appointed a small committee, himself as chairman, to investigate the conduct of the police, and shortly after the House assembled he was able to announce the resignation of Sir E. Y. Henderson, the Chief Commissioner, and to promise that a number of recommendations made by the committee would be adopted.

The primary cause, however, of the meeting in Trafalgar Square which had terminated in so great a catastrophe could not be lost sight of. The aggregation within the Metropolitan district of a vast number of unemployed persons was an indisputable fact; however much opinions might vary as to whether the distress was abnormally acute, whether it was permanent or transitory, or whether there was not work to be found by those who cared to look for it in the proper places. Three solutions were put forward for the difficulties of the situation: the undertaking of public works on a large scale with money provided by the Exchequer; the relaxation of the existing rules under which outdoor relief was distributed; and, thirdly, state-aided emigration. The Socialist ideal of a more equal distribution of wealth, to be brought about if possible peaceably, but if not by violent means, should also be added; but its exponents, though vehement, were not numerous. Whilst these methods were being advocated by their respective enthusiasts, a public subscription was opened by the Lord Mayor to assist the more pressing cases of distress in London, and a sum of upwards of 78,000*l.* was speedily got together, the rioting and looting in the West-End not in any way interfering with the steady flow of subscriptions. An army of almoners was called into existence to distribute locally the funds which were issued from the Mansion House. Opinions, even amongst the clergy of the poorest districts, differed widely as to the wisdom of this mode of relief; but inasmuch as no practical solution was offered in any other way, the objectors limited themselves to rendering the system of wholesale almsgiving as innocuous as possible. The action of the Government in prosecuting Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, and Champion was looked upon at the same time as a mistake from many points of view, and the event proved that, although the accused persons were committed for trial by the chief magistrate at Bow Street (March 8) for inciting the mob to violence. When, however, the case came to be tried at the Central Criminal Court, before Mr. Justice Cave, the jury without hesitation acquitted all the accused, but not before they had been able to make use of the opportunity thus provided for them to enunciate their views and to defend their course of action.

We must now revert to the course of political history. Conventional restraints had up to the moment of their formal resignation of office prevented the outgoing Ministers giving any explanation of the circumstances under which they withdrew from the conduct of affairs. Lord Randolph Churchill was the first to break silence, at a meeting of his constituents (Feb. 18) in South Paddington. On this occasion he addressed himself especially to reconciling the sudden change of attitude towards the Irish Nationalists, as displayed by his colleagues in allowing the Crimes Act to lapse on taking office, and their proposal to ask for fresh powers at the opening of the session. The particular evils against which that Act had been directed had passed away, but in their place had arisen the tyranny of the National League, needing to be dealt with by weapons distinct from any contained in the Crimes Act. "We found," he said, "that over nearly the whole of Ireland, with the exception of some quarters of Ulster, over by far the greater part of Ireland, every Irishman in every action almost of his daily life—the most ordinary action that you can conceive—was acting under a sense of terror and domination exercised by the National League. There are in Ireland now two governments. The whole state of things produced by the existence of these two governments is not only an unhealthy state, not only a ridiculous state, and a highly dangerous state, but it is a highly impossible state of things. Lord Salisbury's Government, having arrived at the indubitable conclusion, after the most anxious inquiry and examination, that that was the state of things, came to the decision that as far as in them lay that state of things should no longer exist. Lord Salisbury's Government, therefore, decided that they would so inform the new Parliament. At this moment, however, occurred a very serious and embarrassing incident. All through December the condition of Ireland had been a subject of the most anxious consideration with the Government, and the decision which we came to was a decision arrived at very deliberately. Like all decisions of that kind, on which almost the future of the country might hang, it was one which could not be arrived at in haste. But when the decision had been finally arrived at, on the eve of the meeting of Parliament, at the time when the terms of the Queen's Speech were under consideration which should announce the decision to Parliament, that most eminent and most estimable nobleman, Lord Carnarvon, threw up the government of Ireland. Now I have no right to say, and I have no particular reason to suppose, that Lord Carnarvon differed from his colleagues as regards the policy which it was necessary to pursue in Ireland. The reasons were given to the public in the correspondence which passed between him and the Prime Minister, and I know *and* believe that those reasons were good and true and sufficient *reasons*. But the fact remains that, at the very moment when *the grave and solemn and serious decision as regards Irish*

policy had to be announced to Parliament there was at the head of the Irish Government no eminent, responsible, experienced English statesman who would cause that decision to be received by Parliament with that weight, that consideration, that importance, and that gravity to which it was entitled, and which were absolutely necessary for it if it were to have fair play. That was the difficulty Lord Salisbury's Government was placed in." Lord R. Churchill then described Mr. W. H. Smith's "act of self-sacrifice and patriotism;" and the result of his short study of the question on the spot, and after consultation with the Irish officials, was that extra power was required by the Government for restoring order in Ireland. Measures were thereupon prepared "which we thought necessary to deal with the whole situation, and there never was a moment's hesitation—undue hesitation—in coming to a decision. Now let the Irish members, if they care to pay any attention to what falls from me, bear this in mind. That decision and determination of the late Government were placed on record, that determination still animates the members of the late Government, and if by any manœuvres of theirs a change of the Government of the country is again effected and Lord Salisbury returns to power, Lord Salisbury's Government will be the only Government in Ireland. That is our intention; and this I may further say—that if the hateful, malignant domination of the League in Ireland had been finally and for ever suppressed, if the restoration of order had been effected, then Lord Salisbury's Government were prepared to propose to Parliament measures the general scope of which had been practically agreed upon—measures which would to a large extent have met the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people, whether as regards local government, or as regards the further settlement of some portions of the eternal Land question, or as regards those wishes of the Catholics of Ireland on higher education, which a large concurrence of the opinion of this country is disposed to look upon as right and reasonable."

Lord Randolph therefore directly challenged Mr. Morley's assertion that the late Government had no policy: "Our policy was to suppress the National League. Mr. Gladstone's policy is to legalise, to recognise, to utilise the National League. Our policy was to assert the government of the Queen in Ireland. Mr. Gladstone's policy is to withdraw the government of the Queen from Ireland." After a bitter personal attack on Mr. Morley, Lord R. Churchill went on to discuss Mr. Gladstone's policy in words which subsequently furnished materials for much angry comment: "Obviously, gentlemen, Mr. Gladstone intends to establish in Dublin an Irish Parliament, he intends to repeal the Act of Legislative Union, and he intends, as far as he can, to effect the dissolution of the unity of the United Kingdom. Mr. Gladstone told the electors the other day in his address to Midlothian that he was comforted in the arduous task he had

to pursue by the knowledge that his policy was a policy of peace. By Heaven, gentlemen, it is a policy of civil war, and imminent civil war. Mr. Gladstone strangely mistakes or altogether dangerously underrates the history, the traditions, and the power of the Protestants of Ireland. The power of Parliament is very great. There are few things which the mind can conceive within the range of practical politics which Parliament cannot do; but there is one thing which it cannot do. The Protestants of Ireland owe allegiance to the Crown and to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and that Parliament cannot transfer their allegiance to any other body whatsoever, except with the full consent of the Protestants. That consent, I think, will never be given. Two other ways remain—namely, either of gaining their consent to the transfer of their allegiance, or of doing without their consent. A great struggle is hanging over the Protestants of Ireland. It is likely before long to be precipitated in an acute form. England cannot leave the Protestants of Ireland in the lurch. England is bound to the Protestants of Ireland; you as Englishmen are bound to the Protestants of Ireland by every conceivable tie. The Protestants of Ireland on an occasion such as this and in a national crisis such as this are the only nation which is known to the English people in Ireland. On four successive occasions they have conquered Ireland practically at the request of England. During 680 years the Protestants of Ireland have held Ireland mainly for the benefit of England. They have developed the resources of Ireland by their capital and their industry under the protection and the guarantee of England. They are one with England, one with the English people, one with you in race and in religion. They are essentially, like the English people, a dominant and an imperial caste, and it is only Mr. Gladstone—it is only the insanity which is engendered by a monstrous and unparalleled combination of verbosity and senility—it is only Mr. Gladstone who could imagine for a moment that the Protestants of Ireland would yield obedience to the laws, would recognise the power, or would satisfy the demand of a parliament in Dublin—a parliament of which Mr. Parnell would be the chief speaker and Archbishop Walsh the chief priest.”

Alluding in conclusion to his approaching visit to Belfast, he asked his hearers what message he should take from them to Ulster. Answering for them amid great cheering, “I believe there will be hundreds and thousands of English hearts—ay, and English hands—who when the moment of trial comes, when the Protestants of Ireland are called upon, as they may be called upon, to give in the most practical and convincing form a demonstration and proof of their loyalty to the English throne, I believe there will be found hundreds and thousands of English *hearts and hands* who will be beside them, around them, and *behind them*, and who will be of opinion that before the unity of



this united Empire is for ever shattered, before the sun of the British Empire shall commence to set, a blow will have to be struck—and a blow will be struck—the sound of which shall go into all lands, and the echoes of which shall reverberate to the uttermost corners of the earth.”

In commenting on this speech, of which the discretion was diversely appreciated but the taste universally condemned, the *Times* said: “Lord Randolph Churchill attempts a defence of the Irish policy of the late Cabinet, which, though acute and ingenious, is, in our judgment, wholly inadequate. Have the public men who on the present great issue are substantially in agreement any guarantee that the Conservatives, after turning out Mr. Gladstone’s Cabinet, may not themselves come to an agreement with the Parnellites on the basis of Home Rule? Lord Randolph Churchill’s speech goes as far as language can go to exclude such a contingency.” The *Daily News*, moreover, pointed out that “Lord Randolph entirely failed to explain why the Administration of which he was a leading member entirely changed its Irish policy between the meeting of Parliament and the despatch of Mr. Smith to Ireland, or why they changed it again between the departure of Mr. Smith and his return. It is amusing to read the brave words in which Lord Randolph Churchill now speaks of his old friends the Irish Nationalists.” The *Pall Mall Gazette* went still further, and, affecting to see in Lord R. Churchill’s speech an incitement to rebellion, asked whether the Government would not prosecute him, and prophesied that he was destined to become before long the head of a Churchill-Chamberlain Cabinet.

It was probably with the object of correcting some erroneous inferences which had been drawn from this speech that Lord Salisbury took the opportunity of a banquet given (Feb. 17) in honour of the return of the four Conservative members for Hertfordshire. After referring to the division on Mr. J. Collings’s amendment on which the Conservatives were defeated, Lord Salisbury described Mr. Gladstone’s method of forming an Administration by including in it a number of people who were exactly and amply pledged to absolutely contradictory opinions on the government of Ireland. This plan of fighting out great questions of policy inside the Cabinet instead of in the House of Commons was not new to Mr. Gladstone. He had adopted it with regard to foreign affairs on a previous occasion when Mr. Bright, the Quaker, was invited in—and the result was the policy of vacillation in Egypt, which had culminated in the death of General Gordon and the discredit of English diplomacy throughout Europe. A similar plan was apparently about to be applied to the treatment of Ireland.

“I do not apprehend,” continued Lord Salisbury, “that we shall hear very rapidly of the policy on which the Government have resolved; and when we do hear of it I doubt much whether



its quality will be of the kind to give us any fair or confident hope of the settlement of the great and terrible problem of Irish government. What is Mr. Gladstone's record as to Ireland? He will go down to posterity as the Minister who deliberately reversed the policy which this country had hitherto pursued. He will go down as the Minister who destroyed the instrument of government by which England had heretofore governed Ireland. But although he destroyed he was not able to set up. Up to the time when he took office, be it for good or evil, for many generations Ireland had been governed through the influence and the action of the landed gentry. I do not wish to defend that system. There is a good deal to be said for it and a good deal to be said against it, and perhaps we are here too many of us connected with the land to be able to exercise an impartial judgment on that point. What I wish to insist upon is not that that system was good, but that the statesman who undertook to overthrow it should have had something to put in its place. He has utterly destroyed it. By the Land Act of 1870, by the Ballot Act of 1879, by the Land Act of 1881, and last of all by the Reform Bill of 1884, the power of the landed gentry in Ireland is absolutely shattered; and he now stands before the formidable problem of a country deprived of the system of government under which it had existed for many generations and absolutely without even a sketch of a substitute by which the ordinary functions of law and order can be maintained. And I fear that in the measures that are before us we shall have the same spirit governing. Those changes which he introduced into the government of Ireland were changes that were admirable from a parliamentary point of view. They were suited to the dominant humour of the moment. They gathered together the necessary majority by which they were passed and which strengthened the Government that passed them. But they were barren of any institutions by which the country could be governed and kept in prosperity for the future." Lord Salisbury then went on to explain the position in which Mr. Gladstone found himself with the Nationalists on the one side and the Moderate Liberals on the other. To the former, his new allies, he would offer the inside of the oyster, "but the shells, properly decorated and illumined," would be the inheritance of his old political friends. In the coming struggle Lord Salisbury declared that he had a sincere and honest dread of "the dexterity of this old parliamentary hand." "I do dread," he continued, "that he will so wrap up his proposals that, while Mr. Parnell will perfectly see what they mean and what is coming, he will for the moment deceive his too credulous and confiding followers. No doubt the plan which he will adopt is the well-known plan of securities. *He will give a parliament at Dublin, an independent parliament, a legislative parliament, but he will surround it with securities. It will bristle with securities.* There will be every kind of pr

hibition laid upon it not to do something which the English nation dreads, and those securities will be of the precise value of any paper barricade that you might like to erect. Do not let there be any mistake about this—once set up a legislature at Dublin, and that legislature will make an independent nation. That legislature will have the power of the purse. Has the power of the purse ever failed to carry every other power with it? That legislature will have the power of permitting the enrolment of volunteers, of patriotic persons who will be entrusted with rifles, and under the officers appointed by that legislature any amount of executive force which it may choose to provide will be provided for the purpose of carrying out such further encroachments upon English supremacy as they may meditate. Of course you may say that it is always possible for us to go to war with them. But you know perfectly well that a remedy so extreme is a remedy that is never carried out."


In anticipation of the reply that such a policy was the denial of the principle of self-government, Lord Salisbury maintained that under Mr. Gladstone's system the self-government of Ireland would mean for those who were not Mr. Parnell's servants absolute slavery: "You are told that you are only asked to give to Ireland what you have already given to Canada; but, setting aside geographical neighbourhood, the difference is enormous. In Canada you had a population that was not exasperated by seven centuries of conflict. In Ireland you must look upon the fact that the majority, whom you are asked practically to place upon the throne of that country, is a majority descended from a long line of ancestors that have never ceased to hate and to fight with England. Well, then, how does that work—supposing that you give Home Rule, that you give the practical independence which any proposal of Home Rule must necessarily bring with it? In time of war you will have on your western side an island controlled, filled, possibly prepared and equipped, by a Government that hates you bitterly. It will be enthroned there; it will have at its hand a large force of men that it will have been able to drill, and such provisions of war material as it will have been able to collect. I do not say that these things will drag you down, but they will mean that a certain portion of your army will be taken up and that a certain portion of your navy will be neutralised and effaced in the task of masking this new enemy which you are now, in mere gaiety of heart, creating for yourselves."

It was not only the danger but the dishonour of such a solution which troubled Lord Salisbury; and he continued: "Now this seems to me a far more serious consideration than any thought of Imperial danger and loss from the granting of Home Rule to Ireland; and do not think that the sacrifice of your honour—if there are any who should be inclined to reduce it to a material denomination and to ask how much it will cost—will

be a costless sacrifice to us. We have already played fast and loose with our honour in such matters too often and too perilously. . . . Already the idea is creeping through the world that English partisanship is a quicksand on which no man can take his stand. It is not in such small matters that your interest is engaged. There are other countries in the world where your Empire is maintained by the faith which men have that those who take your side will be supported and upheld. Whenever the thought crosses you that you can safely abandon those who for centuries have taken your side in Ireland, I beseech you to think of India. I beseech you to think of the effect it will have if suspicion can get abroad there that, should convenience once dictate such a policy, they, like the Loyalists of Ireland, will be flung aside like a sucked orange when their purpose has been fulfilled. The Liberals have presented you with nothing but halting words, an ambiguous policy, and an earnest desire before all things to conceal the proposals which they may be forced to recommend to Parliament. The Conservatives have told you in plain language what it is that they recommend. The Conservatives have told you they recommend the restoration and the upholding of the law in Ireland, and above all to sustain that Union upon which the integrity of the Empire depends."

It has been necessary to dwell at some length upon these two speeches as they indicated in unmistakable terms the line which the Conservatives were prepared to adopt on the Irish question. The occasions selected by the two leaders had no importance in themselves, beyond furnishing them the opportunity of choosing their own time for publishing a policy which the forms of Parliament might not so easily have afforded. A conventional ratification of the policy, however, was given at a meeting at the Carlton Club on the following day (Feb. 18), when it was made clear that the leaders had the thorough support of their party, with the exception, perhaps, of a few extreme Ulster Orangemen who attributed the disaster which had befallen the Conservatives to the ambiguous attitude adopted by Lord R. Churchill and others towards the Nationalists both before and during the elections.

The same evening (Feb. 18) Parliament reassembled, when Mr. Gladstone gave a short statement as to the proposed order of business. The question of Procedure would be at once referred to a select committee. The Government would accept the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech substantially as it stood, including Mr. Collings's amendment, and the Lord Advocate would give notice of a bill on the subject of the Scotch crofter. The Government nights up to the end of March would be required for financial matters, chiefly for disposing of the supplementary *estimates*. *The state of Ireland required the most careful consideration; but he could announce at once that the Government*



did not intend to re-enact repressive measures. Ministers desired to introduce legislative proposals of a substantive character to meet the case of Ireland in respect to social order, the land, and the future government of that country; and by the end of March he hoped to be able to give the House some indication of a part or the whole of the measures which the Government had to propose for dealing with the great question of the state of Ireland.

Mr. Childers was next subjected to a shower of questions on the recent rioting in London. In his statement in reply he laid the whole blame on the police, blaming the inactivity of the reserve men actually in Trafalgar Square, and the blunder by which a hundred men shut up in the grounds of Buckingham Palace were left uninformed of what was happening in Pall Mall. The next point was to get rid of the interrupted Address in answer to the Queen's Speech; and in resuming the debate Mr. Plunket, and after him a number of ex-Ministers, endeavoured, but in vain, to obtain some hint as to the Irish policy of the Government. The utmost that Mr. Gladstone permitted himself to say, in the course of a dignified speech as to the line of conduct he had marked out for himself, was: "When the late Government determined to meet Parliament with its 250 supporters I did not in my own mind condemn them, but I thought they were perfectly aware of the principle that a small minority of the House were not the persons intended to carry on the government of the country, and the conclusion I came to was this—that they were going to continue their association with the hon. member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), and to endeavour to examine whether they could not meet this great Irish question with some more worthy, safer, and more permanent method than the old and often-tried unsatisfactory method of special criminal legislation." Mr. Gladstone concluded by saying that after the discussion of the estimates had terminated he hoped "to be able to open to some degree the views of the Government with regard to those positive and substantive measures of a remedial character for Ireland which we may separate by calling them the question of social order, the question of the land, and the question of Irish government, but which I believe are essentially associated together by bands so strong that it is not in the power of man to disjoin them. We can do no more. We cannot speak of the future. We stand in an attitude in which it would have been absurd and guilty to have pretended to do more. I hope the House will accept our declaration in the good faith in which it has been given, and not accuse us of prolonging uncertainty about Ireland for party purposes."

In the House of Lords Lord Granville made a statement similar to Mr. Gladstone's, though he ventured to fix April 1 for the Ministerial declaration on Ireland; but the most important incident was Lord Rosebery's declaration as to Greece. The

new Foreign Secretary declared that, as regarded Eastern Europe, he accepted the policy of the previous Government. Greece and Turkey were armed to the teeth, and a rupture between them might produce a war of which the consequences would be incalculable. He found on his entry into office engagement with the other Great Powers to prevent that rupture which he could not break if he would, but which appeared to him wise and right, and he should, therefore, carry them out. He trusted this would be understood, for any idea that England was hesitating might produce most disastrous consequences. It was hinted that the combined fleet would compel the Greek ships to retire to their own waters; but whether the Greek admiral would obey Europe or risk the sinking of his fleet was uncertain, although the Greek Government might think that a naval battle would make the Greeks resigned to the failure of their immediate hopes. On the following evening (Feb. 23) the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. J. Morley), in replying to a question with reference to the eviction of an old woman eighty years of age, remarked that, if his continuance in office were prolonged, "every effort would be made to impress upon those whom it concerned his own very strong opinion that what was much wanted in Ireland, not much more among one section of the people than another, was a strict and scrupulous and literal spirit of legality." And he promptly supplemented the doctrine of the need for scrupulous literal legality on the part of the Irish by claiming the right to a large discretion in the enforcement of the law on the part of the English rulers of Ireland as against the tenants: "The executive Ministers must decide for themselves on their own responsibility upon each case of eviction as it arises. I for one am not prepared to admit that we are justified in every case in which a shadow of legal title is made out to bring out the military forces to execute decrees which on the ground of public policy as well as that of equity may seem inadvisable." Policy was to override law, and the executive Government was to decide on its own responsibility when it would and when it would not enforce the fulfilment of contracts. In the House of Lords (Feb. 22) Lord Spencer took the opportunity to say that he entirely agreed with Mr. Morley in what Lord Salisbury had described as the Chief Secretary's No Rent manifesto.

On the previous night, just before the rising of the House, Mr. Courtney briefly moved the second reading of his bill to extend the franchise to all women, being single, unmarried or widows, possessing the qualifications which gave a vote to men. Sir Henry James, supported by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, moved the adjournment on the ground that the lateness of the hour (1 A.M.) prevented a proper discussion of the bill. This *was negatived* by 159 to 102; and after a further attempt to *postpone its consideration* the bill was read a second time *without a division*, as was also a bill introduced by Sir John Lubbock



the "Shop Hours Regulation Bill," limiting the daily labour in shops of persons under eighteen years of age to twelve hours a day.

The important step taken by Lord R. Churchill in visiting Belfast to address the Ulster Tories is referred to at length elsewhere;<sup>1</sup> but it may be noted here that whilst the *Times* regarded his appeal as vigorous and eloquent, regretted its inevitable sectarian tone; and the *Standard* similarly expressed its belief that the tone of extravagance and sectarian bitterness, too often perceptible, detracted very much from the success of the Unionist cause, but it held that Lord R. Churchill was right in impressing on the men of Ulster that the defence of the Union rested with them. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, however, declared that he had "revealed the soul of rebel under the skin of Tory," and that he had laid down the doctrine of the sacred right of insurrection. In the House of Commons (Feb. 26) Mr. Sexton requested the Government to give an opportunity for discussing a vote of censure on Lord R. Churchill for his Belfast speeches, but Mr. Gladstone refused to accede on the ground of the pressing needs of public business.

As might have been expected, the attitude of those Liberals who had voted with the Conservatives on Mr. Jesse Collings's amendment had brought into prominence the position which local committees arrogated to themselves. Acting on their own impulse or under instructions from the central office of the Liberal Association, in Birmingham, they had either called upon their representatives to explain their action, or, as was more frequently the case, had passed votes of censure and warning. When, however, certain leaders of the party conspicuously held themselves aloof from the Ministerial arrangements, the reproaches of their constituents were redoubled. Sir Henry James, whose co-operation Mr. Gladstone had desired to obtain, was especially accused of "insubordination" by his recently found constituents at Bury (March 1); but by the manly and brilliant defence of his course of action he obtained from them a unanimous assurance of confidence and support. He explained to them that previous to his election he had expressed himself opposed to the creation of a separate parliament for Ireland; he had voted against Mr. Collings's amendment partly because it was vague in its terms, but more because it was moved and supported for the purpose of defeating the Government, and he desired to be free and unfettered in the event of his taking office under a new Administration. Mr. Gladstone, he said, had offered him either the Chancellorship or other high office at his own choice; but in view of the pledges he had given to his constituents he was compelled to ask Mr. Gladstone for some assurances as to his intended Irish policy. Failing to obtain these, he could not doubt that it was his duty to hold aloof. He repudiated all intention of entering "a cave"; but he hoped to be able to do

<sup>1</sup> Chapter VII., page 305.



something, on the one hand, to maintain the authority of the Queen over her Empire, and, on the other, to protect Ireland from the horror of bloodshed and civil war. "I desire," he concluded, "to remain in the position—for it satisfies all my ambition—of the humble member for Bury. If I retain it I will strive to serve you faithfully in accordance with such powers as I have. But I ask from you that you will let me serve you not only with my understanding but with my judgment. On such terms I will labour hard in your service. But if you seek for more, if you desire to cramp and to cripple, if you claim my industry only and reject my judgment, then, here to-night, in all submission to you and with no trace of arrogance in my mind, with only one happy grateful thought of the short time during which we have mingled together, I say to you: Pass this your judgment on me, and let me, your servant, depart in peace." To an assertion of independence at once so proud and so humble there was but one response, and in acknowledging the vote of confidence which his constituent voted by acclamation Sir Henry James added: "If in consequence of my action any disagreement should arise among you do not consider me. If as time goes on, and as the election which is sure to come upon us quickly, approaches, you think you can get a Liberal candidate more worthy than I, and on who can poll more votes in this borough and can better unite you, let me go. I not only will stand aside but I will stand by his side, and I will do more for him than I ever did for myself for I will ask men to vote for him, and I will do this because I have an increasing belief in the truth and justice of Liberal principles, and because I believe it is to the benefit of every one of you to be represented by a Liberal member."

In a similar spirit, though scarcely in such stately terms, the other "Independents" asserted the right of private judgment, refusing to regard themselves the delegates of the Caucus or representatives of a section of the Liberal electors. It was not a signal of revolt that had been sounded, as some of the more zealous Ministerialists maintained, but a refusal to submit to the dictation of a local, or even of a central, body, which without responsibility claimed for itself the right of deciding on the policy of the party and the conduct of individuals. In this assumption of the rights of personal judgment lay the ruin, the Radicals asserted, of party government, and the rise of groups or cliques to power and importance. The Conservatives, however, judged the matter differently; and Lord R. Churchill speaking at Manchester (March 3), invited the Liberals to join with the Conservatives in forming a new political party, to which he proposed to give the name of the Unionists—"a party which shall be essentially English in all those ideas of justice, of moderation, of freedom from prejudice, of resolution which are the peculiarities of the English race;" a party which

"might combine all that is best of the Tory, the Whig, and the Liberal—combine them all, whether they be principles or whether they be men." If Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, and Sir Henry James would consider this offer, they would be met more than half-way. The Conservatives would support them if they would form a Government of their own, co-operate with them if they would prefer a coalition Government, and if among the Conservatives there were those with whom the Whigs did not wish to serve, "those persons would cheerfully stand aside." "Our opponents," he declared, "are the party of separation, and they may be known as 'Separatists,' because they are a party—I do not care whether you take Mr. Gladstone's scheme, Mr. John Morley's scheme, or Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, who in one form or another would adopt a policy which would be equivalent to the restoration of the Heptarchy."

But although Lord R. Churchill gave for the first time a quasi-official sanction to the new division of parties into "Unionists" and "Separatists," words which were subsequently to play an important part in the political history of the year, it was rather to Lord Salisbury's speech the same evening (March 8) that men turned for a clear indication of the policy of the Opposition. The occasion was a banquet given at the Crystal Palace to celebrate the Conservative victories in Lambeth, where eight representatives of that party had been returned. Commenting upon the manner in which Mr. Gladstone had composed his Cabinet of avowed Home Rulers like Mr. John Morley and statesmen who had passed their lives in denouncing Home Rule, Lord Salisbury went on to say:—

"There is no doubt that to the head of the Government this ambiguity has a peculiar advantage. You may have seen in the shops—perhaps you may have bought them—garments which have the advantage of being usable either in fine weather or in foul. They bear the name of 'reversible.' Now if in our changeable English climate it is advantageous for a man to have a reversible garment about him, in our changeable English politics it is very useful to have a reversible programme. When Mr. Morley calls upon him Mr. Gladstone is dressed in the garments of Home Rule, and Mr. Morley goes away convinced of the sincere and, I may say, holy attributes of the Minister with whom he has been conversing. When Mr. Gladstone converses with Lord Spencer or with Lord Kimberley, or a great number of other peers whose opinions have always been adverse to Home Rule—and I may add Mr. Chamberlain—then he assumes the other dress. He turns the coat inside out. The reversible garment is exposed on its other face, and they go away convinced of the splendid integrity of the defender of the unity of the Empire. That is as far as we have got in contemporary history. We know that Mr. Gladstone has persuaded two sets of people of precisely opposite opinions that he agrees with th

its quality will be of the kind to give us any fair or confident hope of the settlement of the great and terrible problem of Irish government. What is Mr. Gladstone's record as to Ireland? He will go down to posterity as the Minister who deliberately reversed the policy which this country had hitherto pursued. He will go down as the Minister who destroyed the instruments of government by which England had heretofore governed Ireland. But although he destroyed he was not able to set up. Up to the time when he took office, be it for good or evil, for many generations Ireland had been governed through the influence and the action of the landed gentry. I do not wish to defend that system. There is a good deal to be said for it and a good deal to be said against it, and perhaps we are here too many of us connected with the land to be able to exercise an impartial judgment on that point. What I wish to insist upon is not that that system was good, but that the statesman who undertook to overthrow it should have had something to put in its place. He has utterly destroyed it. By the Land Act of 1870, by the Ballot Act of 1879, by the Land Act of 1881, and last of all by the Reform Bill of 1884, the power of the landed gentry in Ireland is absolutely shattered; and he now stands before the formidable problem of a country deprived of the system of government under which it had existed for many generations, and absolutely without even a sketch of a substitute by which the ordinary functions of law and order can be maintained. And I fear that in the measures that are before us we shall have the same spirit governing. Those changes which he introduced into the government of Ireland were changes that were admirable from a parliamentary point of view. They were suited to the dominant humour of the moment. They gathered together the necessary majority by which they were passed and which strengthened the Government that passed them. But they were barren of any institutions by which the country could be governed and kept in prosperity for the future." Lord Salisbury then went on to explain the position in which Mr. Gladstone found himself with the Nationalists on the one side and the Moderate Liberals on the other. To the former, his new allies, he would offer the inside of the oyster, "but the shells, properly decorated and illumined," would be the inheritance of his old political friends. In the coming struggle Lord Salisbury declared that he had a sincere and honest dread of "the dexterity of this old parliamentary hand." "I do dread," he continued, "that he will so wrap up his proposals that, while Mr. Parnell will perfectly see what they mean and what is coming, he will for the moment deceive his too credulous and confiding followers. No doubt the plan which he will adopt is the well-known plan of securities. *He will give a parliament at Dublin, an independent parliament, a legislative parliament, but he will surround it with securities. It will bristle with securities.* There will be every kind of pro-

hibition laid upon it not to do something which the English nation dreads, and those securities will be of the precise value of any paper barricade that you might like to erect. Do not let there be any mistake about this—once set up a legislature at Dublin, and that legislature will make an independent nation. That legislature will have the power of the purse. Has the power of the purse ever failed to carry every other power with it? That legislature will have the power of permitting the enrolment of volunteers, of patriotic persons who will be entrusted with rifles, and under the officers appointed by that legislature any amount of executive force which it may choose to provide will be provided for the purpose of carrying out such further encroachments upon English supremacy as they may meditate. Of course you may say that it is always possible for us to go to war with them. But you know perfectly well that a remedy so extreme is a remedy that is never carried out.”

In anticipation of the reply that such a policy was the denial of the principle of self-government, Lord Salisbury maintained that under Mr. Gladstone's system the self-government of Ireland would mean for those who were not Mr. Parnell's servants absolute slavery: “You are told that you are only asked to give to Ireland what you have already given to Canada; but, setting aside geographical neighbourhood, the difference is enormous. In Canada you had a population that was not exasperated by seven centuries of conflict. In Ireland you must look upon the fact that the majority, whom you are asked practically to place upon the throne of that country, is a majority descended from a long line of ancestors that have never ceased to hate and to fight with England. Well, then, how does that work—supposing that you give Home Rule, that you give the practical independence which any proposal of Home Rule must necessarily bring with it? In time of war you will have on your western side an island controlled, filled, possibly prepared and equipped, by a Government that hates you bitterly. It will be enthroned there; it will have at its hand a large force of men that it will have been able to drill, and such provisions of war material as it will have been able to collect. I do not say that these things will drag you down, but they will mean that a certain portion of your army will be taken up and that a certain portion of your navy will be neutralised and effaced in the task of masking this new enemy which you are now, in mere gaiety of heart, creating for yourselves.”

It was not only the danger but the dishonour of such a solution which troubled Lord Salisbury; and he continued: “Now this seems to me a far more serious consideration than any thought of Imperial danger and loss from the granting of Home Rule to Ireland; and do not think that the sacrifice of your honour—if there are any who should be inclined to reduce it to *material denomination* and to ask how much it will cost—will

be a costless sacrifice to us. We have already played fast and loose with our honour in such matters too often and too perilously. . . . Already the idea is creeping through the world that English partisanship is a quicksand on which no man can take his stand. It is not in such small matters that your interest is engaged. There are other countries in the world where your Empire is maintained by the faith which men have that those who take your side will be supported and upheld. Whenever the thought crosses you that you can safely abandon those who for centuries have taken your side in Ireland, I beseech you to think of India. I beseech you to think of the effect it will have if suspicion can get abroad there that, should convenience once dictate such a policy, they, like the Loyalists of Ireland, will be flung aside like a sucked orange when their purpose has been fulfilled. The Liberals have presented you with nothing but halting words, an ambiguous policy, and an earnest desire before all things to conceal the proposals which they may be forced to recommend to Parliament. The Conservatives have told you in plain language what it is that they recommend. The Conservatives have told you they recommend the restoration and the upholding of the law in Ireland, and above all to sustain that Union upon which the integrity of the Empire depends."

It has been necessary to dwell at some length upon these two speeches as they indicated in unmistakable terms the line which the Conservatives were prepared to adopt on the Irish question. The occasions selected by the two leaders had no importance in themselves, beyond furnishing them the opportunity of choosing their own time for publishing a policy which the forms of Parliament might not so easily have afforded. A conventional ratification of the policy, however, was given at a meeting at the Carlton Club on the following day (Feb. 18), when it was made clear that the leaders had the thorough support of their party, with the exception, perhaps, of a few extreme Ulster Orangemen, who attributed the disaster which had befallen the Conservatives to the ambiguous attitude adopted by Lord R. Churchill and others towards the Nationalists both before and during the elections.

The same evening (Feb. 18) Parliament reassembled, when Mr. Gladstone gave a short statement as to the proposed order of business. The question of Procedure would be at once referred to a select committee. The Government would accept the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech substantially as it stood, including Mr. Collings's amendment, and the Lord Advocate would give notice of a bill on the subject of the Scotch crofters. The Government nights up to the end of March would be required for financial matters, chiefly for disposing of the supplementary estimates. The state of Ireland required the most careful consideration; but he could announce at once that the Government



did not intend to re-enact repressive measures. Ministers desired to introduce legislative proposals of a substantive character to meet the case of Ireland in respect to social order, the land, and the future government of that country; and by the end of March he hoped to be able to give the House some indication of a part or the whole of the measures which the Government had to propose for dealing with the great question of the state of Ireland.

Mr. Childers was next subjected to a shower of questions on the recent rioting in London. In his statement in reply he laid the whole blame on the police, blaming the inactivity of the reserve men actually in Trafalgar Square, and the blunder by which a hundred men shut up in the grounds of Buckingham Palace were left uninformed of what was happening in Pall Mall. The next point was to get rid of the interrupted Address in answer to the Queen's Speech; and in resuming the debate Mr. Plunket, and after him a number of ex-Ministers, endeavoured, but in vain, to obtain some hint as to the Irish policy of the Government. The utmost that Mr. Gladstone permitted himself to say, in the course of a dignified speech as to the line of conduct he had marked out for himself, was: "When the late Government determined to meet Parliament with its 250 supporters I did not in my own mind condemn them, but I thought they were perfectly aware of the principle that a small minority of the House were not the persons intended to carry on the government of the country, and the conclusion I came to was this—that they were going to continue their association with the hon. member for Cork (Mr. Parnell), and to endeavour to examine whether they could not meet this great Irish question with some more worthy, safer, and more permanent method than the old and often-tried unsatisfactory method of special criminal legislation." Mr. Gladstone concluded by saying that after the discussion of the estimates had terminated he hoped "to be able to open to some degree the views of the Government with regard to those positive and substantive measures of a remedial character for Ireland which we may separate by calling them the question of social order, the question of the land, and the question of Irish government, but which I believe are essentially associated together by bands so strong that it is not in the power of man to disjoin them. We can do no more. We cannot speak of the future. We stand in an attitude in which it would have been absurd and guilty to have pretended to do more. I hope the House will accept our declaration in the good faith in which it has been given, and not accuse us of prolonging uncertainty about Ireland for party purposes."

In the House of Lords Lord Granville made a statement similar to Mr. Gladstone's, though he ventured to fix April 1 for the Ministerial declaration on Ireland; but the most important incident was Lord Rosebery's declaration as to Greece. The



new Foreign Secretary declared that, as regarded Eastern Europe, he accepted the policy of the previous Government. Greece and Turkey were armed to the teeth, and a rupture between them might produce a war of which the consequences would be incalculable. He found on his entry into office engagements with the other Great Powers to prevent that rupture which he could not break if he would, but which appeared to him wise and right, and he should, therefore, carry them out. He trusted this would be understood, for any idea that England was hesitating might produce most disastrous consequences. It was hinted that the combined fleet would compel the Greek ships to retire to their own waters; but whether the Greek admiral would obey Europe or risk the sinking of his fleet was uncertain, although the Greek Government might think that a naval battle would make the Greeks resigned to the failure of their immediate hopes. On the following evening (Feb. 23) the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. J. Morley), in replying to a question with reference to the eviction of an old woman eighty years of age, remarked that, if his continuance in office were prolonged, "every effort would be made to impress upon those whom it concerned his own very strong opinion that what was much wanted in Ireland, not much more among one section of the people than another, was a strict and scrupulous and literal spirit of legality." And he promptly supplemented the doctrine of the need for scrupulous literal legality on the part of the Irish by claiming the right to a large discretion in the enforcement of the law on the part of the English rulers of Ireland as against the tenants: "The executive Ministers must decide for themselves on their own responsibility upon each case of eviction as it arises. I for one am not prepared to admit that we are justified in every case in which a shadow of legal title is made out to bring out the military forces to execute decrees which on the ground of public policy as well as that of equity may seem inadvisable." Policy was to override law, and the executive Government was to decide on its own responsibility when it would and when it would not enforce the fulfilment of contracts. In the House of Lords (Feb. 22) Lord Spencer took the opportunity to say that he entirely agreed with Mr. Morley in what Lord Salisbury had described as the Chief Secretary's No Rent manifesto.

On the previous night, just before the rising of the House, Mr. Courtney briefly moved the second reading of his bill to extend the franchise to all women, being single, unmarried or widows, possessing the qualifications which gave a vote to men. Sir Henry James, supported by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, moved the adjournment on the ground that the lateness of the hour (1 A.M.) prevented a proper discussion of the bill. This was negatived by 159 to 102; and after a further attempt to postpone its consideration the bill was read a second time without a division, as was also a bill introduced by Sir John Lubbock,

the "Shop Hours Regulation Bill," limiting the daily labour in shops of persons under eighteen years of age to twelve hours a day.

The important step taken by Lord R. Churchill in visiting Belfast to address the Ulster Tories is referred to at length elsewhere;<sup>1</sup> but it may be noted here that whilst the *Times* regarded his appeal as vigorous and eloquent, regretted its inevitable sectarian tone; and the *Standard* similarly expressed its belief that the tone of extravagance and sectarian bitterness, too often perceptible, detracted very much from the success of the Unionist cause, but it held that Lord R. Churchill was right in impressing on the men of Ulster that the defence of the Union rested with them. The *Pall Mall Gazette*, however, declared that he had "revealed the soul of rebel under the skin of Tory," and that he had laid down the doctrine of the sacred right of insurrection. In the House of Commons (Feb. 26) Mr. Sexton requested the Government to give an opportunity for discussing a vote of censure on Lord R. Churchill for his Belfast speeches, but Mr. Gladstone refused to accede on the ground of the pressing needs of public business.

As might have been expected, the attitude of those Liberals who had voted with the Conservatives on Mr. Jesse Collings's amendment had brought into prominence the position which local committees arrogated to themselves. Acting on their own impulse or under instructions from the central office of the Liberal Association, in Birmingham, they had either called upon their representatives to explain their action, or, as was more frequently the case, had passed votes of censure and warning. When, however, certain leaders of the party conspicuously held themselves aloof from the Ministerial arrangements, the reproaches of their constituents were redoubled. Sir Henry James, whose co-operation Mr. Gladstone had desired to obtain, was especially accused of "insubordination" by his recently found constituents at Bury (March 1); but by the manly and brilliant defence of his course of action he obtained from them a unanimous assurance of confidence and support. He explained to them that previous to his election he had expressed himself opposed to the creation of a separate parliament for Ireland; he had voted against Mr. Collings's amendment partly because it was vague in its terms, but more because it was moved and supported for the purpose of defeating the Government, and he desired to be free and unfettered in the event of his taking office under a new Administration. Mr. Gladstone, he said, had offered him either the Chancellorship or other high office at his own choice; but in view of the pledges he had given to his constituents he was compelled to ask Mr. Gladstone for some assurances as to his intended Irish policy. Failing to obtain these, he could not doubt that it was his duty to hold aloof. He repudiated all intention of entering "a cave"; but he hoped to be able to do

something, on the one hand, to maintain the authority of the Queen over her Empire, and, on the other, to protect Ireland from the horror of bloodshed and civil war. "I desire," he concluded, "to remain in the position—for it satisfies all my ambition—of the humble member for Bury. If I retain it, I will strive to serve you faithfully in accordance with such poor powers as I have. But I ask from you that you will let me serve you not only with my understanding but with my judgment. On such terms I will labour hard in your service. But if you seek for more, if you desire to cramp and to cripple, if you claim my industry only and reject my judgment, then, here to-night, in all submission to you and with no trace of arrogance in my mind, with only one happy grateful thought of the short time during which we have mingled together, I say to you, Pass this your judgment on me, and let me, your servant, depart in peace." To an assertion of independence at once so proud and so humble there was but one response, and in acknowledging the vote of confidence which his constituents voted by acclamation Sir Henry James added: "If in consequence of my action any disagreement should arise among you, do not consider me. If as time goes on, and as the election, which is sure to come upon us quickly, approaches, you think you can get a Liberal candidate more worthy than I, and one who can poll more votes in this borough and can better unite you, let me go. I not only will stand aside but I will stand by his side, and I will do more for him than I ever did for myself, for I will ask men to vote for him, and I will do this because I have an increasing belief in the truth and justice of Liberal principles, and because I believe it is to the benefit of every one of you to be represented by a Liberal member."

In a similar spirit, though scarcely in such stately terms, the other "Independents" asserted the right of private judgment, refusing to regard themselves the delegates of the Caucus or representatives of a section of the Liberal electors. It was not a signal of revolt that had been sounded, as some of the more zealous Ministerialists maintained, but a refusal to submit to the dictation of a local, or even of a central, body, which without responsibility claimed for itself the right of deciding on the policy of the party and the conduct of individuals. In this assumption of the rights of personal judgment lay the ruin, the Radicals asserted, of party government, and the rise of groups or cliques to power and importance. The Conservatives, however, judged the matter differently; and Lord R. Churchill, speaking at Manchester (March 3), invited the Liberals to join with the Conservatives in forming a new political party, to which he proposed to give the name of the Unionists—"a party which shall be essentially English in all those ideas of justice, of moderation, of freedom from prejudice, of resolution, which are the peculiarities of the English race;" a party which

"might combine all that is best of the Tory, the Whig, and the Liberal—combine them all, whether they be principles or whether they be men." If Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, and Sir Henry James would consider this offer, they would be met more than half-way. The Conservatives would support them if they would form a Government of their own, co-operate with them if they would prefer a coalition Government, and if among the Conservatives there were those with whom the Whigs did not wish to serve, "those persons would cheerfully stand aside." "Our opponents," he declared, "are the party of separation, and they may be known as 'Separatists,' because they are a party—I do not care whether you take Mr. Gladstone's scheme, Mr. John Morley's scheme, or Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, who in one form or another would adopt a policy which would be equivalent to the restoration of the Heptarchy."

But although Lord R. Churchill gave for the first time a quasi-official sanction to the new division of parties into "Unionists" and "Separatists," words which were subsequently to play an important part in the political history of the year, it was rather to Lord Salisbury's speech the same evening (March 8) that men turned for a clear indication of the policy of the Opposition. The occasion was a banquet given at the Crystal Palace to celebrate the Conservative victories in Lambeth, where eight representatives of that party had been returned. Commenting upon the manner in which Mr. Gladstone had composed his Cabinet of avowed Home Rulers like Mr. John Morley and statesmen who had passed their lives in denouncing Home Rule, Lord Salisbury went on to say:—

"There is no doubt that to the head of the Government this ambiguity has a peculiar advantage. You may have seen in the shops—perhaps you may have bought them—garments which have the advantage of being usable either in fine weather or in foul. They bear the name of 'reversible.' Now if in our changeable English climate it is advantageous for a man to have a reversible garment about him, in our changeable English politics it is very useful to have a reversible programme. When Mr. Morley calls upon him Mr. Gladstone is dressed in the garments of Home Rule, and Mr. Morley goes away convinced of the sincere and, I may say, holy attributes of the Minister with whom he has been conversing. When Mr. Gladstone converses with Lord Spencer or with Lord Kimberley, or a great number of other peers whose opinions have always been adverse to Home Rule—and I may add Mr. Chamberlain—then he assumes the other dress. He turns the coat inside out. The reversible garment is exposed on its other face, and they go away convinced of the splendid integrity of the defender of the unity of the Empire. That is as far as we have got in contemporary history. We know that Mr. Gladstone has persuaded two sets of people of precisely opposite opinions that he agrees with them,

and that is all we know." Lord Salisbury then referred to the alleged contract between the Conservatives and the Parnellites again denying, as he and his colleagues had done on previous occasions, that there was a particle of truth in the charge; and he categorically denied the rumour that he and Sir M. Hick Beach were in favour of Home Rule, but had failed to convince the majority of the Cabinet, and to avoid a split had abandoned the project. The Conservative leader then touched upon the dangers awaiting any hasty scheme of land purchase, by which every country gentleman would be hunted out of the country. "I can imagine," he asked, "that the merchants and the bankers and such manufacturers as there are would stay long after the country gentlemen had gone? I deeply fear that you would be left with a vast uninstructed peasantry, governed by an hierarchy that is not too wise. There is another matter I have to notice. I do not think that much-enduring animal, the British taxpayer, altogether to be left out of account. If you once adopt Home Rule—that is to say, if you once relinquish your power over Ireland—you may depend upon it that whatever else Ireland does, Ireland will not pay. You may advance millions upon millions—you may take the most sacred promises you please but if you once relinquish the solid hold of power you may write off those investments as though they had been subscribed to the maintenance of the Mexican Republic."

The policy of concealment and delay which the Government had adopted would accentuate every antagonism in Ireland, and was defending Lord R. Churchill's "brilliantly successful effort" to arouse the Protestants of Ulster to a sense of their danger, but maintained that if it were right that Ireland should be allowed to secede from the larger community of the United Kingdom, it was equally right that Ulster should be allowed to secede from the larger community of Ireland. Lord Salisbury concluded by asserting that the one thing which working-men wanted, in Ireland as in England and Scotland, was stability and confidence which "this Cabinet of concealment and compromise was not giving them. To Mr. Gladstone no laws are fundamental and no rights are sacred. But does that affect merely those who have the rights? He and those who support him try to represent these matters as if they were a question between the rich and the poor, and that the poor had no interest in the maintenance of right and justice. It is absolutely the reverse. This instability which is the curse of our present political condition is fatal—fatal to the interests of the poor and the industrious in a far larger degree than it is fatal to the interests of the rich. And that is the consideration which I would exhort you to take into account when you look at the condition of present politics and ask how it affects the interests of the most numerous and the most necessitous class among us. They more than any other have a claim that our policy should be consistent and



dy. To them steady and stable rights are of the first importance. In this political saturnalia through which we have passed we have seen rights that never before were contested stated as open questions, and we have seen political truths which nobody before opposed treated as matters suitable for discussion. The people who suffer by these things are the poor men. Their interest is principally in stability; their interest is that capital should have every encouragement to come and support enterprise and industry, so that wages might increase and work might abound. But under the pressure of present Radical doctrines all this confidence has been destroyed. Our laws, our institutions, have become a shifting quicksand. Rights that were sacred yesterday are questioned to-day and are ridiculed to-morrow, and the result is that no man dares to venture his capital, lest the laws and rights on the strength of which he ventured it should before he reaps the fruit be destroyed by a reckless policy. No doubt there is a heavy commercial depression over the world, but it weighs with immensely aggravated force over the two countries of England and France, and these are precisely the countries over which the heavy curse of political instability is hanging."

The approval with which these sentiments were received by the *Times* and a large proportion of the London press which virtually supported Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal programme encouraged the Conservatives to harass the Government with questions and resolutions relative to their coming Irish bills. Mr. Holmes, ex-Attorney-General for Ireland, moved (March 4) to suspend the vote for the civil establishments in Ireland until the House was placed in possession of the scheme by which the Government intended to maintain social order in that country. Mr. Gladstone, however, declined to be drawn into any premature statement of his intentions, although rumours got abroad that the Home Rule, pure and simple, would be found to be the basis of the scheme. The consequent withdrawal of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. G. O. Trevelyan was at once assumed to be imminent, although it was shown that in 1874 the former had, when canvassing Sheffield, warmly supported the views of Mr. Butt, the then head of the Irish Nationalist party in Parliament, and had explicitly advocated any concession to Irish self-government short of a dismemberment of the Empire, and had held that the Legislature would move at an accelerated pace without the Irish members. With regard to Mr. Trevelyan, it was rejoined by those who wished him to remain in office that he could hardly leave the Cabinet so long as the loyalty of his quondam chief, Lord Spencer, was satisfied with the provisions of Mr. Gladstone, which he was supposed to have special knowledge. Another view of the position was presented by Lord Hartington at a dinner of the Eighty Club (March 5), and the subsequent policy of the independent Liberals was then indicated, and the attitude



they would assume to both political parties. He spoke of the services rendered to the country by the Liberal party, and showed that extended sympathies were among its chief characteristics. "I admit," he said, "that the presence of so large a party following Mr. Parnell is a proof of the existence in Ireland among a large portion of the population of Ireland of a desire for some change in the parliamentary relations between this country and Ireland. But I cannot admit more than that. Even if I could acknowledge, which I cannot, that the opinion of these eighty-six members who follow Mr. Parnell were a conclusive proof of the opinion of the vast majority of the people of Ireland, I could not even then admit that their wishes, thus expressed, have any legitimate claim to force upon us legislation which we in our hearts and consciences believe would be injurious to the interests, not only of the United Kingdom, but of Ireland herself. We cannot—do what we will—get rid of our responsibility for the government of Ireland. If we believe in our hearts that the concession to Ireland of an Irish legislative assembly will give Ireland better government, that it will not weaken but will rather strengthen the real bonds of unity between this country and Ireland, then by all means let us concede it. But if we do not so believe, remember that we shall be responsible—responsible in the eyes of our own people, responsible in the eyes of the world, responsible to future generations in Ireland itself—for the acts of that legislature which will have been created by our own action, and that we cannot shake off that responsibility—which will always rest upon us—merely by the assertion that we have done it in accordance with the temporary expression of the wish of a majority of the Irish people."

Lord Hartington, however, protested against the doctrine that because one member of the Liberal party, although its chief, should change his attitude, all other Liberals were bound to follow his bidding :—

"The opinions and impressions of Mr. Gladstone are his alone, and members of the Liberal party are in no way committed at the present time to the support or to the adoption of those principles. They have never been submitted to the Liberal party for consideration, still less have they been adopted by the Liberal party at the last election. Up to a recent time, I think, no one could have doubted that, whatever differences of opinion existed among us upon any other subject, upon this one question the English people were practically united—in the opinion that a concession to the Irish people, by whatever strength it might be demanded, for the establishment of an independent legislature was one which could not be conceded. Whatever remedies for the evils of Ireland the English people might be prepared to grant, they have never, up to the present time, conceded the possibility of this one."

Since, however, Mr. Gladstone had consented to examine the *question of a separate parliament in Dublin*, the whole aspect of

the political horizon had been changed. It would be the duty of Liberals to give respectful attention to any proposals coming from such a source, but they would have to look at them from an abstract point of view, as well as in view of any possible alternatives; but not from the point of view of believing that no alternative existed except the concession of the Irish demands. Still he acknowledged that any Cabinet which attempted the government of Ireland without some concession to the hopes that had been raised would meet with serious difficulties :—

“I know that if these hopes should be disappointed the future government of Ireland will require on the part of the people of this country a firmer, a more consistent determination than has ever yet been exercised by them. I do not despair, I do not distrust—it would be treason to doubt—that if need be the people of this country will arouse themselves to any effort of consistent determination which may be required of them. But there is now, in my opinion, one essential preliminary to such an attitude on the part of the people of England. It is necessary that they should know, fully, completely, and in detail, what are the measures which are going to be proposed to them as a policy of peace. It is necessary—it is above all things necessary—that no obstacles should be placed in the way of the fullest and the most complete exposition of the policy of the present Government. The people of this country must know what the scheme, what the plan is. They must be able to judge, they must be able to bring their judgment to bear on the question, whether it presents dangers and risks which they cannot bring themselves to face, or whether it presents so little hope that they are unwilling to face those risks. They must know whether the scheme is one which will be accepted or can be accepted by Mr. Parnell. They must know whether there is any scheme which can be proposed by any responsible English Government which it will be in the power of Mr. Parnell, in the name of the people of Ireland, to accept. When they know these things, when they have had the policy of the Government clearly and fully placed before them, and not before, then they will be in a position to make up their minds and come to a final judgment upon this great issue; and when they are so informed, so instructed, and so prepared, I do not doubt their ability to form a sound judgment upon it. For these reasons, although I have not been able to be a party to this policy of examination and inquiry, I have done nothing—I trust I may never do anything—to put any obstacles in the way. I will not be any party to any attempts to prejudge the policy of the Government by agitation of a political or sectarian character. I will be no party to any attempt prematurely to force the hand of the Government during the brief interval which, most reasonably and justly in my opinion, they have demanded for the full exposition of their policy which they have promised. I will do all that I can to resist any such attempts. I will do all I can to enable the Government to have a fair field for a

of peace to Ireland, and no one would be more rejoiced than myself if it should succeed."

The attitude of the press towards Lord Hartington in consequence of this speech was very noteworthy, the *Daily News* for example, assuring its habitual readers that the "tone and substance of his speech will do more to rivet the confidence of the Liberal party and of the country at large in his strength of will and force of character than any previous incident in his political career. . . . If all honest and sagacious men, to whatever party they may belong, will approach Mr. Gladstone's proposals in the spirit which animated Lord Hartington at the Eighty Club, the problem will soon be solved." The *Times* saw in Lord Hartington's speech "a vindication of political independence and a protest against subservience either to authority or dictation," as well as against the attempt being made to pin the Liberal party to accept the scheme which Mr. Gladstone withheld from public criticism. The *Standard*, however, unable to conceal its disappointment at Lord Hartington's refusal to join or lead a coalition Government, pronounced the speech verbose, tautological, and bristling with reiterated qualifications: "Only a very halting temperament, drenched through and through with the compromising spirit of party, could have enabled a man to deliver himself of observations so vague and inconclusive." The *Daily Telegraph* thought the speech anything but tame and colourless, but rather a most valuable contribution to the public appreciation of the issues about to be raised: "It is probable that the Prime Minister himself as much as the public at large will welcome so fair and open a statement of objections from the lips of a trusted, though moderate and independent, member of the Liberal party."

In the face, however, of declarations so explicit it was impossible for Mr. Gladstone to expect from the Whigs any more than from the Conservatives co-operation in the settlement of the Irish question, if he should decide on the establishment of a separate parliament. On the other hand, until his Land Purchase Bill was produced it was impossible to anticipate to what extent Irish landlords might be tempted by its promises to forego their views on self-government. Mr. Gladstone had stated in the House of Commons (March 4), in reply to an appeal for information as to the Ministerial intentions, that he was searching out positive and substantive remedial measures; and from this the idea grew up that in the scheme he would propose Home Rule and land purchase would be so indissolubly linked together that the adoption of the one involved the endorsement of the other. But, however much public anxiety was excited by the real or supposed intentions of Mr. Gladstone towards Ireland, in the absence of any definite proposals, it was necessary to find occupation for the House of Commons. The requirements of Supply occupied for the most part the time at the

disposal of the Government, but on various private members' measures, as well as by the character of those introduced by themselves, they were able to show the tendency of their domestic policy. In the House of Lords the Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill, very slightly altered from the form in which it had been previously introduced by Earl Selborne, was read a second time (March 1). The principal innovation arrived at was the gradual suppression of private asylums and licensed houses. To reach this gradually the bill proposed that no new licences for such houses should be issued, and that there should be no addition to the number of inmates in those already existing. To remedy some of the abuses which had crept in under the old law, a judicial investigation would have to precede the confinement of any person in an asylum, and the judicial order, if granted, would be good for only three years, at the end of which a fresh investigation of the case would be requisite. Some days later (March 19) Lord Thurlow moved his annual resolution in favour of opening the British Museum and National Gallery on Sundays, urging that the proposal was supported by over two hundred of the London clergy, and it was after a short discussion carried by 76 to 62. In the House of Commons attempts at legislation extended over a much wider extent. Mr. Labouchere found an opportunity (March 5) of moving his resolution declaring it to be inconsistent with the principles of representative government that any member of the Legislature should derive his title to legislate by right of hereditary descent. In a speech full of point and epigram Mr. Labouchere pointed out that his motion did not commit anybody to a single chamber, but only to the removal of such an anachronism as an hereditary chamber. He maintained that its abolition would be perfectly constitutional, and that there would be no need to have recourse to physical force, as Lord Salisbury had suggested. The debate was short and uninteresting, except on account of Mr. Gladstone's closing speech. The Prime Minister said he could not agree to the broad and unqualified terms of the resolution, but admitted the importance of the question. He could not admit that the legislative action of the House of Lords had given general satisfaction, and especially dwelt on its original action with respect to the Franchise and Redistribution Bills. The main strength of the House of Lords, he said, lay in their local rather than in their legislative action; and while he could not deny that there was a case for serious and radical change in the House of Lords, he was not inclined to the total abolition of the hereditary principle. It was a large and comprehensive question, he remarked, which could not be dealt with piecemeal, and he opposed the motion because of his inability to vote for the declaration of an abstract resolution unless he was able to follow it up by action.

The division, however, showed, to the surprise of many, that

Mr. Labouchere's resolution was rejected by only 202 against 166, and that in the minority were four peers' sons—two of whom, Lord Wolmer and Mr. Bernard Coleridge, would in the natural course succeed to their fathers' titles and seats.

Another proposal of a less Radical nature, perhaps, but not the less indicative of the temper and Home Rule tendencies of the new House of Commons, was brought forward a few nights later, when (March 9) Mr. Dillwyn brought forward his resolution: "That as the Church of England in Wales has failed to fulfil its professed object as a means of promoting the religious interests of the Welsh people, and ministers to only a small minority of the population, its continuance as an Established Church in the Principality is an anomaly and injustice which ought no longer to exist." Mr. Dillwyn urged that, in spite of the non-existence of a religious census, it appeared clear from the statistics prepared by the Nonconformists that the Church of England could only rank as third among the religious denominations of Wales. The Congregationalists, numbering 253,000, stood first, and were closely followed by the Calvinistic Methodists with 250,000, whilst the Church of England could only count 217,000 members. In addition to these three large bodies there were the Baptists numbering 144,000, the Wesleyans 78,000, the Roman Catholics 50,000, the Primitive Methodists 17,000, and various smaller sects 8,000. Out of a total of 1,343,000, therefore, the Established Church only represented about one-sixth of the population, and Mr. Dillwyn maintained that the differences between the Welsh and English in thought, language, feeling, and religion were increasing instead of diminishing, and that "it could not be denied that Wales is practically a separate nationality." The resolution having been seconded by Mr. Richards, Mr. Albert Grey moved an amendment proposing reforms in the organisation of the Church as best calculated to adapt itself more efficiently to the religious needs and wishes of the Welsh people; and he urged in support of his view that comprehension so as to include the chief Welsh churches within the scope of the Establishment was preferable to disestablishment. Mr. Raikes, in resisting both the motion and the amendment, declined to admit that the Established Church in Wales had failed to fulfil its object. He declared, moreover, in contradiction of Mr. Dillwyn, that the Established Church was the largest denomination in Wales, and insisted on the frequent use made of the churches of the Establishment by Welsh adherents of other sects. Sir William Harcourt, on behalf of the Government, pointed out that the Church of England in Wales was so much an integral part of the Established Church in England that it was impossible to deal with it separately. In the end, the main division took place not on Mr. Dillwyn's resolution, but on the question whether it should be put to the vote *unamended*, or be amended as Mr. Albert Grey proposed. Two



hundred and twenty-nine voted against its being amended at all, including three Cabinet Ministers (Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. Childers, and Mr. Mundella), who intended to vote against Mr. Dillwyn's resolution had it been put. There were, however, 241 in favour of amending its terms before taking the vote, in order that the sense of the House might be taken on Mr. Albert Grey's amended resolution. Thus it was carried by a majority of 12 that the resolution should be amended. It was then carried by 251 against 152, or by a majority of 99, that Mr. Albert Grey's words be inserted; after which, the resolution as it stood in Mr. Albert Grey's form—viz. declaring that the Established Church had failed in Wales, and that it needed to be so reformed as to be better adapted to the needs of the Welsh people—was rejected by 346 to 49.

The companion question of the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Scotland was brought forward about three weeks later (March 30) by Dr. Cameron (Glasgow), who asserted that three-fifths of the population of Scotland and a large majority of the Presbyterians, laity as well as clergy, were in its favour. Mr. Hunter (Aberdeen), in seconding the resolution, contended that there was nothing in the question to prevent an immediate settlement, and that it would be to the interest of the Established Church to at once make terms with the other churches. Sir Donald Currie moved and Mr. E. Robertson (Dundee) seconded an amendment that, having regard to the recent declaration of the Prime Minister (during his electoral campaign) that the question should be left as much as possible to the spontaneous action of the country, the House declined to entertain the proposal until the wishes of the people of Scotland had been ascertained. The motion was likewise opposed by Mr. J. A. Campbell (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities), Mr. Parker, and Sir J. Fergusson, and finally by Mr. Gladstone, who was of opinion that this was a question which should be considered with respect to the circumstances of the case, and not upon a broad abstract principle. He deprecated leaders of political parties taking the initiative in the case of Church disestablishment, and insisted much on the fact that the question was not before the country at the last election. He was unable to support the motion or the amendment, and had no alternative but to leave it entirely to the people of Scotland to say whether or not the existence of the Church should continue. The amendment having been negatived without a division, the motion was then put and was also negatived by 237 to 112. The majority of Scotch members present voted with Dr. Cameron, but a still larger number abstained altogether; their actual numbers being, 25 for disestablishment, 16 against it, and 31 absent. Three Cabinet Ministers (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. G. O. Trevelyan) voted in the



minority; and Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Childers, and nearly all the members of the Government took no part in the division.

Mr. Mundella's Railway and Canal Traffic Bill was a more practical attempt at legislation; and Mr. Mundella (President of the Board of Trade) in introducing it (March 11) explained that the inequalities of the rates charged for different articles of produce, according as they were British or foreign, showing sometimes a variation of 50 per cent., showed the necessity of legislation. In the first place the bill would constitute a new court to take the place of the existing Railway Commission; and the powers vested in the Chief Commission would be exercised in England by one of the judges of the High Court, nominated from time to time by the Lord Chancellor; in Scotland, by a judge of the Court of Session, nominated by the Lord President; and in Ireland by one of the judges of the High Court, nominated by a like authority. The other two Commissioners would be laymen, practical men of business. In every proceeding before the Commissioners the Chief Commissioner would deliver judgment, and on all questions of law his opinion was to prevail. The court would proceed to every locality where its services might be required, whether in England, Scotland, or Ireland. The lay Commissioners would sit in Scotland with a Scottish judge and in Ireland with an Irish judge. Every order of the Commissioners would have the force of a judgment; and no appeal would be allowed on any question of fact, but on questions of law an appeal would lie to a superior Court of Appeal. Beyond this there would be no appeal, unless the Court of Appeal themselves directed an appeal to the House of Lords. The court would have jurisdiction over all matters relating to tolls, rates, and fares; they would be empowered to award damages and to transfer rating appeals from other courts. The *locus standi* of parties qualified to make complaints in regard to rates would be so enlarged as to include corporations, local boards, quarter sessions, and chambers of commerce and agriculture. The companies would be required within twelve months to submit a revised schedule of rates and charges, and the Board of Trade would be empowered to appoint assessors to inquire into and settle these rates. To remedy cases of undue preference and unfair rates, the Board of Trade would appoint Commissioners to receive complaints, examine and make reports, and generally to secure publicity as to the details of the management of each company, and thus bring public opinion to bear upon the railway companies. This bill, as might have been anticipated, excited the opposition of the railway companies, and efforts, combined and individual, were made to induce Mr. Mundella to modify the position he had taken. Public opinion, as well as the more discriminating criticism of the chambers of commerce and agriculture, supported the views of the President of the Board of Trade, and *strongly encouraged* him to proceed; and there was good reason

at one time to believe that the bill might become law, for it passed its second reading (May 6) without its opponents daring to take a division, but unfortunately it had ultimately to be withdrawn in consequence of the sudden closing of the session.

The needs of the public services during this interval occupied the greater portion of the Government time in the House of Commons. Before Mr. Hibbert could make his statement on the Navy estimates Lord Charles Beresford intervened with a resolution declaring that the large number of the unemployed skilled artisans in the shipbuilding ports offered a suitable occasion for increasing our naval defences. He based his argument on the ground that there were upwards of 80,000 artificers of various kinds out of employment; that the materials of which ship armour was composed were fifty per cent. below the average price; and that the actual strength of the navy was not sufficient to perform all the duties possibly required of it in case of war. He did not urge the Admiralty to go on building heavy iron-clads, chiefly because France had left off constructing this kind of vessels; but he maintained that in strength of armament that country was superior to us. Our chief weakness was in rapid-steaming cruisers, of which at the end of 1885 we had forty-one, but of these at least eighteen were obsolete. There remained, therefore, twenty-three useful ships, and seventeen more were in construction. That number he considered wholly insufficient in order to maintain our supremacy. In the Channel we ought to have twelve, in the Mediterranean eight, on the North American station five, on the South American three, on the West Coast of Africa two, in the Pacific four, on the China station twelve—that sounded a great many; but the French had seventeen vessels in the Chinese waters—in Australia five, at the Cape four, on the East India station five, which brought the total up to sixty, whereas we had only got forty. And that left none for the protection of our great mercantile marine. To make up the deficiency we should build at once twenty more—five of the *Australian* class at a cost of 260,000*l.* each, in all, 1,300,000*l.*; fifteen of a new class of 2,000 tons of twenty knots, costing 110,000*l.*, or 1,650,000*l.* in all. That would give us not one more than we ought to have. Three heavy armour-clad cruisers ought also to be laid down. In all classes connected with torpedo warfare we were lamentably weak when compared with France. Our Admiralty had three *Scouts* laid down and one building; two *Curlews*, which were useless; and four *Grasshoppers*, a very excellent class of ships. The latter were 450 tons burden, and their speed twenty knots. These with the *Polyphemus* steamer made only eleven sea-going torpedo boats. He believed the French had now about eight sea-going torpedo vessels, and had laid down another twelve. We had only got out one of these, and would only have eleven altogether. To put our navy right in this class he should say

that we ought to build twenty-one of the *Grasshopper* class at 57,000*l.* apiece, entailing a further cost of 1,217,000*l.* He next suggested that we should do away with all classes of torpedo vessels of the boat class between the 135-foot sea-going boat and the 66-foot boat that was now carried in the *Hecla*, and that would be carried in the torpedo-boat ships. As compared with other countries, our navy showed that of the only boats (over 100 feet) considered useful in rough weather, Great Britain had 62; Germany, 59; Italy, 47; France, 57; Russia, 26; Austria, 30. His own belief was that the torpedo-boat of the future was that known as the Austrian "Falke" type, 135 feet long, and capable of going twenty-three knots an hour; and he urged the Admiralty to look ahead and to build forthwith forty vessels of this class at a cost of 17,000*l.* each. Lord C. Beresford, moreover, urged the absolute necessity of having training squadrons and naval manœuvres on every station; that the ships of the mercantile marine should be organised to take part in at least their own defence and, finally, he urged that some definite scheme for the defence of our coaling stations should be adopted without delay. The total cost of his scheme for the reorganisation of the navy Lord C. Beresford placed at 5,577,000*l.* And this sum, he urged might be obtained without burden to the taxpayers by the temporary suspension of the sinking fund or by the creation of terminable annuities.

Mr. Gourley seconded the motion; and Mr. Bethell, dwelling on the advantages of torpedoes over guns, recommended that improved scientific education in torpedo warfare should be provided. Mr. Jenkins held similar views, but, while advocating the importance of cruisers, he deprecated any further expense being incurred on large ships. Mr. Pearce dwelt upon the importance of increasing the number of ironclads, and Sir D. Currie spoke in support of the motion. Sir J. Commerell complained of the obsolete character of many of the vessels now in use.

Sir T. Brassey differed from Lord C. Beresford as to the absolute necessity of the immediate expenditure he recommended, and pointed out that twice as much money was now being spent in this country as in France. At the same time he hoped that the expenditure during the current year would be in the direction suggested by Lord C. Beresford, and maintained that the completion of the ships now in hand would enable the Admiralty next year to propose an extensive programme of new construction. Captain Field strongly recommended the appointment of a committee to inquire into Admiralty administration and expenditure. Sir E. Reed denied that the appointment of a committee was required, because an important change had recently been effected in the method of constructing armoured belted vessels, and contended that the proposals of Lord C. Beresford would cost more than double the sum he mentioned. Lord G. Hamilton expressed satisfaction that the present

Admiralty had accepted the programme of their predecessors as regards large vessels, but pointed out the necessity for providing smaller ships, torpedo-boats, and supplies of ammunition, in order to utilise the expenditure which had already been incurred. He advised the Government to raise an additional sum of 2,000,000*l.* by means of terminable annuities in order to get the navy into an efficient condition. Mr. Duff, on behalf of the Board of Admiralty, argued that the fighting strength of the navy would be maintained by the two large ironclads laid down by the previous Board, and went on to enumerate the provision made for torpedo-boats and the progress made for the defence of the coaling stations. Mr. Ritchie maintained that at least a million of the Vote of Credit spent on the navy during the late scare had been absolutely wasted. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, dealing with the financial aspects of the proposal, said it was impossible to increase the present Naval estimates, and he strongly deprecated borrowing money in time of peace for warlike purposes. Sir M. Hicks-Beach doubted whether the Government were adequately providing for the defence of the coaling stations in the way contemplated by Lord Northbrook and Lord Hartington in 1874. On a division the motion was negatived by 206 to 98; but it was then too late to proceed with the estimates, and by consent a vote for 61,400 seamen and boys, including 12,000 marines, was taken without discussion. On the next opportunity (March 18) Mr. Hibbert formally introduced the estimates of the current year. Touching at the outset on the difficulties of his task, he pointed out that, in addition to his newness of office, and the fact that three Boards had sat in Whitehall in the last eight months, there had been important changes at the Admiralty, and a considerable number of new officials recently appointed. Next he showed that the estimates as framed conveyed a larger amount of information than had ever been laid before the House before, especially in regard to shipbuilding; and replying to those who had criticised the shipbuilding programme as inadequate, he showed that more than six millions in addition to the ordinary estimates had been spent on the navy in the two previous years. The total amount required for the year was 12,993,000*l.*, or 606,000*l.* in excess of the sums voted in the previous year. This heavy sum was rendered necessary by the large liabilities involved in carrying out the shipbuilding programmes of Lord Northbrook and his successor, Lord G. Hamilton. Upon the former's programme the liability was 3,500,000*l.*, and upon the latter's 2,600,000*l.*, in addition to one of 236,000*l.* for torpedo-boats ordered out of the Vote of Credit. Of this total, 3,828,000*l.* had to be paid during the financial year, whilst the total liability for ships in course of construction exceeded 13,000,000*l.* Great attention, Mr. Hibbert declared, had been paid to the development of the torpedo flotilla, and several sea-going torpedo-boats were rapidly

approaching completion. The Admiralty, he said, would use every means to expedite the building of ships, which he showed by comparative statements of the cost of vessels would lead to a great saving. At the present time nearly a million and a half was spent on the navy above the average of the six years respectively of Lord Beaconsfield's and Mr. Gladstone's Administrations; and though the present Board admitted the necessity of laying down new ships of the smaller class, he said they wished to have more time to consider what types they should adopt. But he contended that a considerable number of torpedo and other boats were already being constructed; and with regard to the line-of-battle ships he described in detail the *Nile* and the *Trafalgar*—the most important ships, as he said, which had ever been laid down. Their cost would be nearly a million each, and he thought they would be the last ships of the kind ever laid down either here or elsewhere.

Mr. Hibbert then went on to describe the progress made in the construction of guns and the provision of ammunition, adding incidentally that 541 torpedoes were then ready, and that by the end of the year we should only fall short by about 300 of the total number required. In conclusion he paid a warm tribute to the reforms effected by Lord G. Hamilton in the reorganisation of the Admiralty, which, he said, must inevitably lead to considerable economy in dockyard expenditure. Lord G. Hamilton in the course of a general review of the estimates, endorsed Mr. Hibbert's approval of their form, and testified to the zealous assistance which he had received from the permanent officials of the Admiralty in his reforms. Alluding to the great apparent cost of the new armoured ships, he pointed out that, all things compared, they were not more costly than their predecessors. He repeated also his contention that we ought to build a smaller and more rapid class of vessels, which he thought wiser than subsidising the mercantile marine.

Sir T. Brassey entered upon a detailed criticism of Admiralty administration, and favourably compared the condition of the English with the French navy, both as regards speed and cost of construction. He heartily approved the proposed capitation grant to the Naval Artillery Volunteers, and recommended that squadrons of large vessels should occasionally be sent to foreign stations instead of single ships of smaller size. Sir J. Gore expressed the hope that an early opportunity would be afforded for discussing the dockyard vote. He gave a distinct denial to the charge made by the committee of the Admiralty against the dockyard workmen as a class, and maintained that the defectiveness of dockyard administration was due entirely to the niggardly policy of the Admiralty. Mr. R. W. Duff gave particulars as to the supply of guns and ammunition, and took the opportunity of paying a tribute to the officers and men of the Naval Brigade engaged in the Burmese expedition. Mr. Jacks suggested the



in order to ascertain the proper cost of war vessels the estimates of private contractors should be compared with the cost of vessels constructed in the Government dockyards, and not with that of ships constructed by foreign nations; and after some discursive remarks from Mr. Puleston, who complained of the action of the Admiralty with regard to the dockyard workmen, Sir W. Crossman drew attention to the anomalous position of officers of the Royal Marines, and Mr. Forwood impressed upon the Admiralty the importance of taking advantage of all modern improvement in naval engineering. Lord C. Beresford had no wish to be extravagant, but desired to see the navy put into a thorough state of efficiency. More vessels, he said, were needed, greater speed was required, and the number of non-combatants in a vessel ought to be materially decreased. He fully recognised the value of marines, and urged that the position, pensions, and rank of engine-room artificers should be placed upon a more satisfactory basis. Captain Verney and Captain Price also discussed the various questions raised, and Mr. Ritchie expressed his gratification that the programme of the late Board had been to a great extent adopted by their successors, but he was afraid that the reduction in the amount had been obtained by allowing the naval stores to fall lower than at any time during the last thirteen years.

No further opportunity of criticising the naval policy of the Government presented itself during the session; but on the dockyard vote being taken (June 10) Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, in order to show his mistrust of large ironclad ships, moved to reduce by 10,000*l.* the amount required for the construction of the *Nile* and the *Trafalgar*. The representatives of the Admiralty Board defended the proposed expenditure, and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's amendment was rejected by 160 to 84. The subject of the defence of our coaling stations, however, was brought up again by Mr. W. H. Smith (March 22) previous to the discussion of the Army estimates; and on this occasion the ex-Secretary for War referred to the way in which the Liberal Government, after making full inquiries, had delayed taking any steps which their own advisers had pronounced indispensable for putting the military ports at home and abroad in a satisfactory state. Lord Hartington, early in 1885, when Secretary for War, had admitted that at least two and a quarter millions were needed for this purpose. Lord Northbrook, Mr. Childers, and other members of the Liberal Government had so frequently and openly expressed similar opinions, that the Government of the day virtually was under an engagement to the House of Commons to make proposals for the completion of these works of defence. If Parliament remained indifferent to the warnings of its leaders, it was because it declined to be moved by those who were responsible; but if it refused to grant the money needful for these works, *at all events* let it have an inquiry as to the



facts, if only in the interests of economy, and to save the country from seeing another five millions squandered at the next panic which seized the country. If the committee of inquiry should find such works to be necessary, Mr. Smith asked that they should put it in the power of the Government to carry them out; or if they found the works to be unnecessary, he called upon the House openly to repudiate the system of protection, which was actually illusory, but which he believed to be necessary. Mr. Woodall, as Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, objected on behalf of the Government to a select committee, as bringing matters of such extreme delicacy to the knowledge of other nations. The Government did not underrate the advantage of placing those important places beyond risk, and Mr. Woodall admitted that the works were still without the armaments with which they ought to be supplied. As to the importance of providing submarine defences, he was glad to be able to state that with regard to the Thames and the Medway, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Milford, and other ports, the submarine mines were in such a state of completeness that they could at the shortest possible notice be put into action; and they had corps of skilful men capable of working those scientific forms of defence, whilst Portsmouth, Plymouth, and the Thames were protected by the engineer militia of those ports. He was able also to give an assurance as to the satisfactory nature of the submarine defences of Malta, Halifax, and Bermuda, which made those stations absolutely secure from attack by sea. The Government certainly attached greater importance to the proper protection of our coaling stations in the Eastern than the Western seas, and he was happy to say that with regard to those the progress made was quite satisfactory, and that at the present moment their *personnel* and *matériel* were complete. The confident hope expressed by Mr. Childers in the previous year that the fortification works then in progress might be completed in March 1888 was justified by the actual result, and it was satisfactory to know that there had been very cordial co-operation in the matter between the colonial authorities and the home Government. The highly patriotic spirit which had been exhibited at Hong Kong and Singapore, where large sums had been devoted to the armaments wanted, was particularly gratifying. Still there remained the important duty of organising a flotilla of torpedo-boats, steam launches, and so forth, to keep constant watch over the defences. That subject was engaging the very serious attention of the Secretary of State. By the end of the coming financial year he believed that every important commercial port would be placed in such a position as to be able to give a very good account of an invading squadron. There remained the necessity of providing buildings and stores of every kind, and these were now in hand and steadily progressing. There had been organised a special coast battalion of *Royal Engineers*, for the exclusive duty of working these

defences. The result of their experience of the four great estuaries had been so encouraging that they had made provision in the estimates for the Forth, the Tay, the Humber, the Tees, and Falmouth. With regard to the fortification of these important forts, he was unable to say more than that the subject was under consideration; but the estimates included a vote of 10,000*l.* for the Tyne, which was not merely a commercial harbour, but was also a great arsenal. A short discussion followed, in the course of which Lord Hartington said that the works would never be satisfactorily done until some Government undertook to raise the sum required by loan, and to complete them in one or two years.

Before going into committee on the Army estimates, however, the Government ran the risk of an unexpected defeat. Mr. Howard Vincent, on the question of supply, interposed with a motion to the effect "That in the opinion of this House, for the efficiency and development of the Volunteer force, an immediate increase in the capitation grant is absolutely and urgently necessary." In the course of a speech which was listened to with marked attention, Mr. Vincent explained the growing requirements of the Volunteer force, and in an interesting review of its history showed how its cost had gone on gradually increasing, and how the officers, out of whose pockets this cost had in a great measure been borne, were getting wearied, and were no longer willing to come forward with the same liberality. An additional grant of 10*s.* per head, amounting to about 100,000*l.*, was urgently needed. This motion was seconded by Mr. Gurdon, speaking on behalf of the provincial corps, and supported by Mr. Isaacs, who maintained that the present capitation grant was totally inadequate to secure efficiency; and by Colonel Salis-Schwabe, an ex-cavalry officer, who, although strongly opposed to any unnecessary increase in the Army estimates, protested against the expense of maintaining the Volunteers falling upon the officers of the force.

Sir E. Hamley, a distinguished officer and competent authority, further compared the cost of the Volunteers with what would be the cost of an army recruited by conscription, and, after paying a tribute to their loyalty and efficiency, insisted upon the necessity of an additional grant.

Mr. Gladstone, somewhat to the surprise of his own party, then rose, and instead of dealing with the arguments put forward by those who had spoken in support of the motion, protested against its unconstitutional character, proposing as it did to increase the charges upon the people beyond the amount asked for by the Executive. He declared, moreover, that he would never accept orders from the House of Commons to increase the public expenditure, and declined to argue with the supporters of the resolution whether or not it might not have the contrary effect of reducing the *Military estimates*. Mr. Gladstone, however.

promised that the Secretary of War would fulfil his promise consider the matter carefully, but that beyond that he would not go, asserting that if the resolution were carried it would have effect upon the action of the Government.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach expressed surprise at the uncalled-for speech of the Prime Minister, and, while admitting the general accuracy of the constitutional doctrine he had propounded, insisted that any member of the House was entitled to call attention to a grievance, which was all that the motion aimed at. He twitted Mr. Gladstone with refusing to accede to a necessary outlay for the efficiency of a valuable force while he had unnecessarily wasted millions in the Soudan, and hoped that the Secretary for War would make a more soothing reply, and not descend to the unfair claptrap of the Prime Minister.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, referring to the wording of the resolution, contended that it was in reality a vote for an increased sum on that proposed; but Mr. J. H. Macdonald maintained that the motion was framed in a perfectly constitutional manner.

The Secretary for War, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, rather threw over the argument of his chief. He admitted that financial difficulties existed in some corps which he hoped to remove but was waiting for returns he had called for before coming to a conclusion on the subject. He, meanwhile, fully recognised the justice of the principle endorsed by Lord Bury's committee that the cost of maintaining the efficiency of the Volunteer force was properly chargeable on the public. In spite, however, of this concession Mr. Howard Vincent refused to withdraw or modify his resolution as suggested by Sir H. Havelock-Allan, and in the division it was negatived by the narrow majority of 187 to 166.

Among other subjects brought forward were the position of Militia staff-sergeants, introduced by Colonel Waring; the insufficiency of the soldier's rations, by Dr. Farquharson; the arming of the Volunteer Artillery, by Mr. Mark Stewart; and compulsory retirement, by Colonel Duncan. At length, soon after midnight, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman was able to make an explanatory statement of the Army estimates. The total sum asked for was 18,233,000*l.*, of which 15,156,000*l.* was for effective service, being an increase on the estimates of the previous year of 440,000*l.* for effective, and 385,000*l.* for non-effective, the increase being due chiefly to India and Egypt. These estimates, he said, reckoned that the British forces in Egypt would be reduced in the course of the year to 8,000, but it was impossible to say at present how this could be effected. On the other hand, the increase of the Indian establishment would be 10,000, for each battalion of infantry was to be increased by 100 men; three battalions were to be added to the army in India and two troops were to be added to each cavalry regiment. With regard to organisation, he regretted that the necessi-

of our Egyptian operations were answerable for great derangements. Passing to the details of the votes, he explained and justified at length the considerable increases which had occurred in several of the chief items, drawing attention, among others, to the increase of 10,000*l.* for horses, of 50,000*l.* for the auxiliary forces, 38,500*l.* for the Army Reserve, and 361,200*l.* for the stores vote. Egypt, he said, was responsible for 474,000*l.*; while, on the other hand, 120,000*l.* would be saved by the reduction of price in some descriptions of stores. Dealing with recruiting, he paid a handsome compliment to the retiring Inspector, General Bulwer, and mentioned that the number passed into the army last year was 39,971, out of 69,401 who had offered themselves. The quality, as well as the quantity, of the recruits was good, and the desertions were only 2,975. In regard to the Militia, he said the reports were most favourable, as also were the reports of the Volunteers in almost every respect. The increase in efficient was 10,000, the increase in the capitulation grant amounted to 18,000*l.*, and there has been considerable improvement in the shooting. The Army Reserve now amounted to 51,000. On the vote for warlike stores Mr. Campbell-Bannerman dwelt at some length, explaining how the net increase of 341,200*l.* on the total of 2,569,000*l.* had arisen from the necessity of manufacturing naval and military guns.

"Hon. gentlemen," he said, "who were not members of the last Parliament may not be aware of the tremendous revolution that has taken place within the last few years in the designs of guns, both great and small. The change from muzzle-loading to breech-loading has been due not so much to any caprice or ingenuity of gun inventors as to the discovery of the great results attained by slow-burning powder, which require for their development a long gun, and thus necessitate breech-loading. Again, the gun is now made of a new material, steel, which has been perfected for the purpose. The new gunpowder, also, of which I have spoken, is greatly more costly and requires special appliances for its manufacture. Then there are machine guns and torpedoes, and all the paraphernalia connected with them. Now, in all these matters, we in this country have been slower than our neighbours to adopt the new systems, and we may at least hope that we thus gain the advantage of benefiting by the latest improvements; but the result is that the whole of this costly expenditure falls upon us now. This is the cause of the startling increase to the vote of recent years. Let me take for example the amount of the naval gun estimate, which is borne on the Army estimates and included in this vote. In 1880-81 it was 308,000*l.* In the following years it was 369,000*l.*, 616,000*l.*, 500,000*l.*, and 500,000*l.* This brings us to last year, when it rose to 850,000*l.*, while this year it will be 1,000,000*l.* The fact is that the types are now settled, the designs are completed, the ships are being pushed on, and the guns must be

ready; and so with all the other kinds of warlike machinery. I assure hon. members that it has been no easy task, though it was a necessary one, to restrict the vote within its present limits. Many excellent ambitions and praiseworthy efforts have had to be checked and delayed or sacrificed, and I must bear testimony to the reasonable spirit in which the officers of the department accepted the restrictions which I frankly admit that I have felt it my duty to impose upon their most creditable desire to extend and accelerate its work. Now as to particular things in this respect. Of the 110-ton gun there will be three completed by March 31, and there remain four under order. Of the 68-ton there are one completed and 28 under order. Of the 45-ton there are 14 completed and eight under order. Of the 10-inch there is one under order; of the 9·2-inch there are 22 completed and 19 under order; of the 8-inch there are 35 completed and two under order; of the 5-inch there are 334 completed and 136 under order; and of the 4-inch there are 113 completed and 37 under order. There have also been made or provided for 315 6-pounder and 29 3-pounder quick-firing guns, 1,366 Nordenfelt and 491 Gardner machine guns, and 1,262 Whitehead torpedoes. I may add that experiments of the most interesting kind are being made at Aldershot with different sorts of machine guns for use with cavalry and infantry. Of the new 12-pounder breech-loading field gun we expect that nineteen service batteries in all will be provided by the end of the year. With regard to small arms, the Committee is aware that during last summer the pattern of the new .4-bore rifle (also, I believe, called the Enfield-Martini) was settled, and owing to great exertions in the department 1,000 will have been turned out by the end of this financial year. Preparations had been made for great activity in production during next year. This is, however, one of the services in which it has appeared to us that with the smallest detriment to the public interest the rate of manufacture may be slackened, and we provide for turning out only 55,000 of the new rifle for Imperial service in the coming year. We, however, proceed with the increase to the plant at the factories, which will add to the power of the department to manufacture a large quantity of these weapons at a rapid rate in case of urgency. I need not say that the lowering of the rate of production both at Enfield and at Woolwich from that which was maintained under the Vote of Credit will involve some reduction in the numbers employed, although, as I have already stated in the House, I trust that the reduction will be so arranged as to cause the smallest degree of hardship. But the Committee will not think some reduction unreasonable in the light of figures which I have quoted, and of the fact that, out of a total number of workpeople of 13,213, no fewer than 4,569 were entered since April last."



All discussion raised by the various points of the Secretary for War's speech was by consent adjourned, and the vote for men and wages agreed to. Three days later (March 25) a long and discursive debate on armaments, recruiting, compulsory retirement, and other questions took place, and in the course of the evening the Contagious Diseases Acts, 1866-69, of which the operation had been suspended for two years, were repealed on a resolution moved by Mr. Stansfeld and supported by the Government, after the defeat by 245 to 131 of an amendment moved by Sir John Kennaway for the maintenance of adequate hospital accommodation. A bill in accordance with this resolution was subsequently read a second time the same evening (March 25), and, passing through all its stages in both Houses without amendment, received Royal assent (April 16).

The practice of introducing the Civil Service estimates with an explanatory statement by the Secretary to the Treasury had been abandoned after a very short experience, and the criticism of the House was exercised upon the details of the various votes as they were brought forward. The total amount of the estimates exclusive of the Revenue estimates, which were presented separately, was 18,008,691*l.*, as compared with 17,725,764*l.* in the previous year, the chief increase being upon the vote for Education. In the debates which arose the illusory nature of the control supposed to be exercised by the House of Commons was shown in a striking manner. On the vote for royal parks and pleasure-grounds (Class I., vote 6), Mr. Labouchere moved (March 11) the reduction of the vote 50,403*l.*, contending that the maintenance of the London parks should be thrown upon the local rates. Mr. H. Fowler, the Secretary to the Treasury, and in charge of the estimates, did not attempt to defend the vote, but proclaimed his satisfaction that the views he had advocated as a private member had been so warmly taken up. When the question came to a division Mr. Fowler, together with all the members of the Government, supported the vote, but were defeated by 131 to 114. When the House next met, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply to a question stated that it was impossible to accept the amendment; and subsequently (March 18) the Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. H. Fowler) moved the re-vote of the sum struck off, promising, however, that a bill should be brought in to transfer the parks in London, other than royal parks, to the Metropolitan Board of Works. This concession satisfied the Radical members by whom the vote had originally been opposed, and it was understood that Battersea, Finsbury, and Victoria Parks should be those of which the maintenance would in future be thrown upon the local rates.

The discussion of the Education vote was, for unavoidable causes, postponed until the second reading of the Appropriation Bill (June 17), when the Vice-President of the Council (Sir L. Playfair) made his customary statement. The amount required



for the service of the year 1886-87 was 3,422,989*l.*, showing an excess of 123,092*l.* over the vote of the previous year. The principal causes of this increase were, Sir L. Playfair explained, the bringing in of the waifs and strays and the increase of the population. At the same time he argued that the education provided had improved in quality, costing 17*s.* 6*d.* per child, as compared with 17*s.* 1½*d.* spent in 1885-86. Taking the whole population of England and Wales at 27,499,041, there would be required 4,583,175 places to be provided in the schools; but there were already 400,000 places in excess of these requirements. As to the actual attendance, Sir L. Playfair said that while for every 100 children who ought to attend 91 places were provided in the public schools, 80 were on the registers and 62 in daily attendance. The total daily attendance of children on the register was 76·4 per cent.; but this left considerably over a million unaccounted for. There were at that time 4,630,000 children actually attending public schools, and whereas the attendance in 1869 was 7 per cent. of the whole population, it had risen at the close of 1885 to 16·67 per cent. In the expenditure of the previous year was included 757,000*l.* voluntary contributions, or 6*s.* 7¾*d.* per child; 1,141,000*l.*, or 19*s.* per child; and 1,791,000*l.* from school pence, or 11*s.* 2¾*d.* in voluntary schools, or 9*s.* 4*d.* in board schools. In the year 1880, 81·2 per cent. had passed the then required standards, and 24·61 had passed Standard IV. and upwards; whilst in 1885, 85·14 per cent. had passed, and 24·61 per cent. had passed Standard IV. and upwards. The attendance in our schools, Sir L. Playfair asserted, was much superior to that in foreign schools; and in regard to over-pressure he quoted from Mr. M. Arnold's report, according to which English children were at work for twenty hours per week on seven subjects, while in Germany children were thirty-two hours in school with thirteen subjects. On the subject of technical education, he pointed out that, until the report of the commission on these subjects had been more carefully studied and discussed, no step of importance in this direction could be taken.

In order to arrive at the means by which the Government proposed to meet the expenditure of the year, it is necessary for the moment to pass over many important matters which are dealt with in the following chapter. The strong desire evinced by Mr. Gladstone when settling the order of public business to interpose the Budget between the two Irish bills had led many to suppose that the financial proposals of the Government would contain some startling proposals, or hold out alluring hopes to those members of his party whose allegiance was supposed to be lukewarm. On the other hand, the adversaries of the Ministry anticipated that Sir W. Harcourt's first appearance as a Finance Minister would still further weaken the confidence of political economists in the principles which they regarded as vital to the well-being of the State. Both parties were equally

disappointed. Sir W. Harcourt's Budget was, perhaps, the least sensational that had been submitted to the House for many years. "The Cottage Budget" was the name applied to it, on the ground that its only original feature was the abandonment of a trifling licence for cottage brewing. In one respect Sir W. Harcourt departed from the custom of his predecessors, dealing only with the differences between the estimates and the results of the previous year, instead of the actual figures. The total revenue received had been 89,581,301*l.*, against an estimate of 90,790,000*l.*, while the expenditure, estimated at 93,617,171*l.*, was actually 92,223,844*l.*, so that there was altogether a deficit of 2,642,543*l.*, which, owing to the savings on the expenditure, was 184,628*l.* less than was estimated. Giving some details of the falling off in the revenue, he showed that the alcoholic revenue had declined by 971,000*l.*, and on the last ten years by 4,379,000*l.* The railways had fallen off 51,400*l.*, the income-tax was less by 240,000*l.*, and the inhabited house duty by 30,000*l.*; but there was an excess over estimate on death duties of 230,000*l.* Having given similar details as to the expenditure, the Chancellor proceeded to compare the net revenue of the past year with the revenue of 1875-76, which, he said, excluding the income-tax, was about the same—namely, 62½ millions, though there were many fluctuations in the items. The great feature was the decline in the alcoholic revenue, which since 1875-76 had fallen from 31,209,000*l.* to 26,830,000*l.*, or, allowing for the increase in population, it was 14*s.* 9*d.* instead of 19*s.* 1*d.* per head. He attributed this chiefly to increased temperance, and that it was not due to decreased consuming power he showed by reference to the increases in other branches of the revenue, such as tea, tobacco, dried fruits, bacon, sugar, &c., which had made good at least half of the loss on the alcoholic duties. In further illustration of this, he gave the salient figures of the Post Office and Telegraphs revenue, in which, however, there was a decrease, owing to the large capital expenditure. The increase in the parcel post receipts in the previous year had been 40,000*l.*, and the number of parcels, which had been estimated by Mr. Fawcett at 27,000,000, had actually risen to 26,527,000. The sixpenny telegram had caused considerable loss, the cost of sending a message being greater than the price received for it, the total loss on telegraph service since 1880-81 having been at least half a million. Touching next on the income-tax, he showed that the yield, which in 1842-43 was 772,000*l.* per penny, and in 1852 810,000*l.*, has now risen to 1,980,000*l.*, though this was a falling off from 1883 and 1884, when it had been 2,016,000*l.* and 2,004,000*l.* In further proof of his assertion that the consuming power of the people had not diminished, he referred to the savings-banks deposits, which had risen from 67,575,000*l.*, or 2*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.* per head of the population, in 1875 to 97,306,000*l.*, or 2*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.* per head. On the whole, during the last ten years

there had been a loss on alcohol of 4,500,000*l.*, of which 1,200,000*l.* had been recouped by other taxes, and 3,300,000*l.* by natural growth. Passing to the expenditure, he showed next that since 1875 the expenditure had increased 10,864,000*l.*, of which half had been during the last two years. The great increase, of course, had been on the army and navy, which in two years had increased by 4,800,000*l.*—viz. 2,512,000*l.* for the army and 2,288,000*l.* for the navy. The total increase of expenditure, civil and military, in the last eleven years amounted to 11,732,000*l.*, which was about covered by the 6*d.* added to the income-tax since that period, of which at least 3½*d.* was devoted to military charges. Passing then to the present and immediate future, the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave his estimates of revenue and expenditure for the year 1886–87 as follows:—

REVENUE.		EXPENDITURE.	
Customs . . . .	£19,700,000	Consolidated Fund Charges	£30,639,917
Excise . . . .	25,710,000	Army . . . .	18,233,200
Stamps . . . .	11,365,000	Navy . . . .	12,993,000
Land-tax and House-duty .	2,920,000	Civil Service . . . .	18,008,691
Property and Income-tax .	15,755,000	Customs and Inland Re-	
Post Office . . . .	8,270,000	venue . . . .	2,753,563
Telegraphs . . . .	1,730,000	Post Office . . . .	5,211,955
Crown Lands . . . .	370,000	Telegraphs . . . .	1,845,510
Interest on Advances . .	1,165,000	Packet Service . . . .	735,663
Miscellaneous . . . .	2,900,000		
Total . . . .	£89,885,000	Total . . . .	£90,428,499

—showing a deficit of 543,499*l.* for the coming year. This deficit Sir William Harcourt proposed to meet by suspending the two Sinking Funds (without, however, touching at all the terminable annuities, which constitute the chief Sinking Fund), amounting respectively to 613,000*l.* and 205,000*l.*, or 818,000*l.* in all. This would reduce the Consolidated Fund charges from 30,639,917*l.* to 29,821,917*l.*, and would so turn the deficit of (in round numbers) 544,000*l.* into a surplus of 274,000*l.* There would still be 5,958,000*l.* applicable to the reduction of the Debt—viz. 4,774,000*l.* terminable annuities and 1,184,000*l.* from other sources. After some further remarks as to the management of the Debt, he explained the particulars of a total remission of the cottage brewing licence duties for all premises under 8*l.*, which would affect some 60,000 persons, and would cost the revenue 16,000*l.* The final result of his calculation, therefore, to meet an estimated expenditure of 89,610,229*l.* was to provide a total revenue of 89,869,000*l.*, leaving a final surplus of 258,771*l.* This, he remarked, was a commonplace Budget, but he hoped that it was also a common-sense one; and he wound up by enforcing on the House the necessity of increased thrift and economy.

The only other important measure which the Government, having introduced, were able to carry through satisfactorily was

the Scotch Crofters Bill. Mr. Trevelyan, in moving leave to bring in a bill (Feb. 25) "to amend the law relating to the tenure of land by crofters in the Highlands and islands of Scotland," declared that the cause of grievance from which the crofters suffered arose from deer-forests taking the place of sheep-walks in so many districts. Following the line of the recommendations of the Royal Commission, the Government proposed to secure to the crofters fair rents and fixity of tenure, but would not give them the right to purchase their holdings. Compulsory leases, which, he contended, would alone meet the case of the crofters, would be given within strict limits, and Commissioners would be appointed to carry this proposition into effect. The Radical members for the most part professed disappointment at the narrow scope of the measure, and maintained that it would at best prove a temporary palliative. On the motion for the second reading (March 8) the critics of the bill mustered in force on both sides of the House; but as both Conservatives and Liberals saw that something must be done, its progress was not delayed. Mr. Ramsay opened the debate by moving an amendment that provision should be made for assisting the voluntary emigration of families from congested districts, referring especially to islands on the West Coast. Speaking with the advantage of practical knowledge, supported by the recommendations of the Royal Commission, Mr. Ramsay strongly condemned the notion that temporary relief would meet the case unless it were combined with measures for permanently relieving the pressure of population on the means of subsistence. Whilst blaming the attempt of the Government to interfere with the rights of landlords, he was ready to admit the economic objections to the encouragement of the growth of population without providing means for its support. His chief stricture on the measure was that it was either framed or designed with the intention of deceiving the people, by making them suppose that Parliament was providing for their future prosperity, when, in point of fact, they would have to depend, as every other worker, upon their own industry and self-denial. Sir Herbert Maxwell, in seconding the amendment, complained that of the six recommendations made by the Royal Commission the only one adopted in the bill was that referring to the increase of the land at the disposal of the crofters. He maintained that the bill as it stood would confer benefits which were only illusory, and, while repudiating the suggestion that the depopulation of the Highlands and islands was due to the action of the landlords, advocated a system of State aided and directed emigration as being most calculated to effect the objects aimed at in the bill.

Mr. J. H. Macdonald, who in the Conservative Administration had held the post of Lord Advocate, regretted that the recommendations of the Royal Commission had not been imported into the bill, and, in the course of an exhaustive ex-

nation of the difficulties of the crofter question, contended that the bill would not effectually remedy existing grievances or bring about the results which were anticipated. He said that the Government had picked out those parts of the report of the Royal Commission which could be adopted without making demands on the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Fixity of tenure, fair rent, compensation for improvements, and extension of grazing land—things involving no public outlay, but indicative of a parsimonious policy—were the prominent features of the bill, and he advocated in their place legislation which would promote emigration and education, and would encourage the people to take up other industries, and not to rely wholly upon agriculture. Mr. Macfarlane and Mr. Fraser Mackintosh, representing the crofters' views, adopted a very different line of criticism. The latter described it as a "lawyer's bill," which would fail to remedy the grievances of the crofters; and the former complained of the restrictions and omissions of the bill, and hoped that adequate amendments would be introduced in committee. He objected to the emigration clause, and insisted that the only proper means of mitigating the evils of the congested districts was by giving the people land at fair rents and with fixity of tenure.

On behalf of the Government, the Lord Advocate replied in detail to the objections of Mr. J. H. Macdonald and others, and explained at length the provisions of the bill, which he denied would be ineffectual, as alleged. He drew attention to the difficulties of proposing the expenditure of public money for the benefit of a particular class, but mentioned that a clause would be introduced in committee to enable the Government to make grants for improving the fishing industry. He pointed out that the question of emigration did not apply to Scotland only, and agreed that education combined with facilities for locomotion would materially relieve the congested districts without the adoption of a system of State-directed emigration.

The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. G. O. Trevelyan), following the same line of argument, complained that neither of the late law officers for Scotland had offered any constructive assistance in settling it. He argued that emigration, even if it were possible to vote public money for the purpose, would not remedy the grievances of the crofters, and repeated that the objects of the bill were to secure fixity of tenure, certainty of rent, compensation for improvements, and more land for cultivation.

On behalf of the Conservative Ministry, Mr. A. J. Balfour denied that it was the duty of the late law officers for Scotland to offer assistance in the preparation of the bill. He contended that fair rents and fixity of tenure would fail to secure the benefits expected, and, while declining to oppose the bill, maintained that the condition of the crofters would not be improved by a fundamental alteration of the Land laws. The amendment was then *withdrawn*, and the bill read a second time without a division.



Before going into committee (March 29) an alteration moved by Mr. C. McLaren to extend the provisions of the bill to other parts of Scotland was, after a short debate, negatived by 287 to 91, and an amendment moved by Sir G. Campbell in favour of giving pecuniary assistance in certain parts of the country to carry out the bill was, after a lengthy debate, withdrawn. Amendments to extend the land tenure advantages to cotters was negatived by 196 to 105, and the general provisions of the bill to fishermen by 219 to 108; and a third, to limit its operation to holdings valued at 4*l.* and upwards, by 248 to 112. A host of minor amendments followed on the various clauses of the bill, occupying four sittings of the House. Very few, however, were accepted by the Government. Amongst the more noteworthy was Mr. A. Balfour's attempt (April 15) to exempt sporting lands unavailable for the extension of crofters' holdings, which was negatived by 192 to 98; but Mr. Fraser Mackintosh's proposal that one of the Commissioners should speak Gaelic was agreed to (April 19) without a division. On the motion of the Lord Advocate new clauses were added to the bill to enable the Fishery Board for Scotland to make advances by way of loan for the purchase and equipment of fishing-boats, and to exempt from the operation of the bill holdings in the possession of the servants of the landlord. The motion for the third reading (May 10) having been challenged by Mr. Macfarlane, the House divided, and it was passed by 219 to 52, and forthwith sent to the House of Lords, where it reached the committee stage (May 27) without serious impediments. At this point, however, the Duke of Argyll proposed various amendments which materially altered the original scope of the measure. One of these was an addition to clause 1 to the effect that "the crofters shall not persistently violate any written condition for the protection of the landlord's interest, or the interest of the neighbouring crofters, which is legally applicable to the holding, and which shall be sanctioned as reasonable by the Land Commissioners." This was agreed to without discussion, as was a further one in clause 16, to the effect that, "in the event of a crofter bequeathing his holding to any one more distant than wife, son, grandson, brother, or son-in-law, or of the holding coming to the heir-at-law, it should be competent to the landlord to represent that it was for the interest of the adjoining crofts that such holding should be added to them." On the third reading (June 1) the Earl of Wemyss offered a vigorous protest against the bill, but did not challenge a division; and it was then sent to the Commons with the amendments which had been introduced. The majority of these were agreed to without division, and with very slight alterations the bill at length received Royal assent (June 25) and became law.

Foreign affairs were the subject of few questions and little debate in either House. The attitude assumed by Lord Salisbury in the *Bulgarian question* was maintained by his successor, and



in the subsequent difficulties arising out of the obstinate refusal of Greece to disarm at the joint demand of the Great Powers, Lord Rosebery displayed a firmness and sagacity which won for him applause on all sides. He took an active part in bringing about an understanding between Prince Alexander and the Sultan on the subject of the government of Eastern Roumelia, which the former, after much hesitation, was induced to accept for a period of five years. In the Greek difficulty Lord Rosebery was fortunate enough to preserve, at all events outwardly, intact the European concert, and was able to announce (April 1) that the withdrawal of the Russian squadron from Suda Bay, on the declaration of the blockade of the Greek ports, was only temporary, and that he had received from the Czar's Government the most cordial promises of co-operation. In Egypt he arranged for the withdrawal of British troops from Wady Halfa to Assouan; and although the negotiations with the Egyptian Government, entrusted to Sir Drummond Wolff by Lord Salisbury, seemed to bear but little fruit, Lord Rosebery continued to support the policy of conciliating Turkey, and endeavoured to arrive, in concert with the Sultan, at some way of ensuring to Egypt that freedom and autonomy which had been the aim of successive British Cabinets.

### CHAPTER III.

The Government of Ireland Bill—First Rumour as to its Nature—The Schism in the Liberal Party—The Attitude of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan—Their Resignation—Mr. Caine's Election at Barrow—Death of Mr. W. E. Forster—Mr. Gladstone's Bill—His Speech—Mr. Chamberlain's and Mr. Trevelyan's Explanation—Debate—Speeches by Mr. Parnell, Lord Hartington, Mr. J. Morley, Mr. Goschen—The Bill read a First Time—Opinions of the Press—The Meeting at the Opera House—Ipswich Election—The Irish Land Question—Sir James Caird's Views—Lord Monteagle's—The Land Purchase Bill introduced—Mr. Gladstone's Speech—Mr. Chamberlain's and Mr. Parnell's Criticism—Public Opinion.

THE obstacles which Mr. Gladstone had encountered in the formation of his Administration must have convinced him that he could no longer hope to lead a united Liberal party. As the session advanced individual divergences became more and more accentuated; groups of hostile Whigs and dissentient Radicals were to be ultimately fused into a powerful body which was to determine the fate of the Ministry. From the very first Mr. Gladstone made no concealment of the tendency of his own mind; and, as if the appointment of Mr. John Morley to the most important post in the Cabinet in view of the coming legislation of the session had not been sufficient warning, Mr. Gladstone took the first opportunity (March 4) of declaring that he was searching out positive remedial measures for the wrongs of Ireland. Simultaneously there appeared an unofficial, but *also uncontradicted*, assertion that proposals on the basis of

Home Rule had been submitted to certain members of the Cabinet, and the inference was drawn that Mr. Trevelyan, and possibly Mr. Chamberlain, as well as other members of the Cabinet, might withdraw. The objections of the two Ministers were, however, stated to be based upon very different grounds, Mr. Trevelyan being unable to accept the idea of an Irish Parliament, whilst Mr. Chamberlain was opposed to the principle of advancing a large sum of money, the loss of which would fall upon the British taxpayers, in order to buy out the landlords' interest in the land. Although the first draft of the scheme drawn up by Mr. Gladstone himself, assisted by Mr. John Morley and Sir Robert Hamilton, was avowedly intended only "for examination and inquiry," it was clear, from the tone adopted by the *Daily News* and the *Birmingham Post* (as representing the two chief influences within the Cabinet), that, however ready the Prime Minister might be to modify the details of his scheme, he would prove immovable on the principles it asserted. Consequently, when the resignation of both Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan was first circulated (March 16), and at once contradicted, the general opinion was that the rumour was only premature. Writing on the following day, the *Times* said:—

"We do not think there is much chance of averting a rupture by the most skilful manipulation of details. The paramount question of our time is whether the leading men in the Liberal ranks, who have not altogether handed over their intelligence and their consciences to the custody of Mr. Gladstone, will not only refuse to become parties to a plan so extravagant and reckless, but will take the lead in opposing it. The course taken by Lord Hartington and his friends leaves little to be desired; and if Mr. Chamberlain is now prepared to act with as much courage and firmness, there is good hope that the preposterous policy incubated by the Prime Minister may be got rid of by the House of Commons. Mr. Chamberlain is justified, on the lowest ground of political expediency, in refusing to have a share in such a policy. But in his speeches on the Irish question he has taken a higher tone, and if he is now firm in standing by his convictions, and bold in attacking measures he regards as dangerous to the State, he will vindicate the faith of those who have discerned in his Radicalism a strong leaven of imperial instincts and patriotic spirit."

The *Daily News*, which presumably enjoyed a larger, though not very marked, share of Ministerial confidence, pretended to enlighten its readers as to what was passing in Downing Street:—

"What has really happened is, we believe, that the President of the Local Government Board and the Secretary of State for Scotland have addressed to Mr. Gladstone letters setting forth their views on the scheme dealing with the ownership of land in Ireland—views which had already been indicated in Cabinet Council. One thing is certain, that, either with or without the

assistance of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Gladstone will go forward with his plan for the final settlement of the Irish question, will take the judgment of the House upon it, and will thereafter, if necessary, appeal to the final tribunal of the people. But, driven to arithmetical computation, the inference is not on the side of two members of the Cabinet being right and twelve being wrong. The salvation of Ireland is not to be bought without money and without price. Our belief is that the English people will pay any reasonable price rather than be driven back to the brutal expedient of coercion; and there is no other alternative from the broad lines of Mr. Gladstone's scheme."

The *Daily Telegraph*, which was taking up a more independent line than it had adopted during Mr. Gladstone's previous tenure of office, wrote in almost a prophetic strain: "Something else besides the Unity of the Kingdom is involved in the present crisis. The future of the Liberal party depends on it, and the action of Mr. Chamberlain in quitting the Cabinet or retaining his place will be decisive of English politics for many years to come. If Mr. Chamberlain leaves, the Home Rule scheme will be the work of one man, the personal and last achievement of Mr. Gladstone himself. With him will disappear all Liberal complicity with the proceeding—all the indignity attached to a proposal born of panic and nursed by party feeling. It is thus in Mr. Chamberlain's power not only to raise his own high reputation as a man of rigid honesty and stern independence, but to preserve the Radicalism of the future from a lasting stain. Such a secession would have one great merit—it would, we believe, make the proposed surrender impossible. Whether, however, he sinks or swims, Mr. Chamberlain, by secession, will have cleared himself. Lord Hartington has saved Moderate Liberalism from association with surrender. Mr. Chamberlain has to rescue Radicalism from the stigma of an anti-national scheme."

On the other hand, the provincial Liberal press showed symptoms of no diminution of Mr. Gladstone's popularity, but rather of the belief that any measure he might produce would ultimately tend to good, and that it might therefore be accepted without apprehension. The *Leeds Mercury*, which, through Mr. Herbert Gladstone's connection with the constituency, often correctly mirrored what was passing in the mind of those composing "the inner Cabinet," affected to make light of the threatened resignation: "We do not believe that the effect will be serious. The real blow to the unity of the Liberal party and to the authority of the Prime Minister was given when Lord Hartington declined to enter the Administration. Mr. Chamberlain makes a mistake if he supposes that he will have the country on his side, merely because the operation which he refuses to sanction is one of such vast dimensions. There is another point to be taken into consideration in estimating the probable effects of his resignation. *That is, that men who have at least as high a character for sobriety*

of judgment and soundness of economic creed as that which the member for Birmingham possesses, are known to be satisfied with Mr. Gladstone's proposals on this subject of the land."

But, in opposition to these views, the *Birmingham Post*, which might be regarded as the official mouthpiece of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends, insisted upon the right of each member of the Cabinet to have a voice in the policy put forward in their joint names: "Doubtless, when Mr. Gladstone's plans are developed and publicly stated on his own authority, the seceding Ministers owe it to the country, as well as to themselves, to exercise the freedom of fair and honest criticism. They must frankly explain and justify the reasons for their dissent and withdrawal. But they will do so in a spirit of wholly sincere personal friendliness. Till then, no doubt, their views will remain unexpressed. And it must be so with all who take part in the guidance of the Liberal party, or who profess to interpret its policy and to reflect its views. But, while waiting for Mr. Gladstone's plans, and while reserving judgment upon them, we are bound to say that confidence is rudely shaken by the incidents of the last few hours. If Ministers themselves are gravely divided, how can we hope for a unanimous decision from the country?"

That Mr. Gladstone himself was unwilling to lose the co-operation of two distinguished colleagues was natural; and probably every means was resorted to to induce them to postpone their decision until after the formal introduction of the Irish Bills. The date originally suggested (March 22) was allowed to pass, and a fair excuse was found in the state of Mr. Gladstone's health. But when the day which had been named by Lord Granville (April 1) also went by without any definite arrangement being made, the public naturally supposed that difficulties within the Cabinet were not altogether foreign to this unforeseen delay. But even Mr. Gladstone himself could have had but little confidence in an agreement with the dissentients, since the names of their impending successors were announced, or prophesied with such accuracy as to suggest the existence of anticipatory plans on the part of the Prime Minister. Meanwhile Mr. Bright's mediation was suggested, and Mr. Gladstone was reported to have explained to his former colleague many of the details of his proposed scheme. He was, however, scarcely successful in enlisting him for an ally; but on Mr. Chamberlain's side a programme was put forward which, it was suggested, might form the basis of a compromise. According to this scheme an Irish National Assembly, sitting at Dublin, would be "free to make bye-laws," but "subject to the authority" of Parliament; able to levy rates, but leaving the "Queen's taxes to be settled at Westminster." Mr. Chamberlain, moreover, according to this version, was ready to accord to Ireland the liberty to manage her own affairs; but he would not on any account erect "another sovereign authority similar to the Imperial Parliament,"

and his wish was that not a single Irish member should be removed from St. Stephen's. It was, however, scarcely likely that Mr. Gladstone would consent to cut down his project of a Statutory Parliament to the moderate proposition of a National Council with few or no legislative functions; and after much hesitation, and many efforts to effect an understanding with their colleagues, Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan formally resigned (26th) their respective offices, and their place was immediately filled by Mr. Stansfeld and Lord Dalhousie, the latter without a seat in the Cabinet.

Parliamentary etiquette imposed momentary silence upon both retiring Ministers as to the causes which had led to their withdrawal, and in the meanwhile public opinion was more exercised in discussing the expediency of Mr. Gladstone's tactics than in the motives of Mr. Chamberlain's decision. The coolness which had sprung up between the older and younger leaders of the Radicals dated from the election campaign, when Mr. Gladstone had somewhat ostentatiously refused to endorse Mr. Chamberlain's scheme of Land Reform, and subsequently had refrained from taking him into his confidence with regard to his Irish policy. Mr. Gladstone, moreover, had skilfully managed to draw Mr. Chamberlain into his new Cabinet, and in this way to obtain an influence over the knot of politicians who followed the latter's lead; and he may have hoped that even after Mr. Chamberlain's individual defection he would still be able to exercise authority over his personal adherents to prevent the split in the Liberal party becoming serious. Mr. Chamberlain's secession, however, produced one immediate result, of which Mr. Gladstone seemed to take but little notice—namely, a general and outspoken expression of dislike to any Land Purchase Bill which should involve an immediate or prospective burden to the taxpayer. It was, however, on this Land Bill that Mr. Gladstone would have to rely to make his Home Rule Bill tolerated by the Peers. When, however, it became clear, from the general drift of public opinion, that the Land Purchase scheme, if grafted on the Home Rule Bill, as originally intended, would hamper the passage of that measure through the House of Commons, it was announced that the two schemes would be introduced separately, and at a certain distance of time. The situation as judged by the press showed more unanimity than usually prevailed on such critical occasions. The *Times* earnestly called upon not only Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan to explain the motives of their resignation, but it declared that a similar duty was incumbent on Lord Hartington and those Liberal politicians who declined to enter Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet on the basis of an alliance with Mr. Parnell. The *Times* further maintained that it rested with Lord Hartington to make the first move when Mr. Gladstone brought forward his measure. "It would be a disaster," it wrote, "if Lord Hartington were to stand aside and



to cast the responsibility of opposing Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme on the leaders of the Opposition. It cannot be affirmed that the new appointments will strengthen Mr. Gladstone's position in Parliament. The mere withdrawal of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan, even if they were to remain neutral, must very seriously weaken the Treasury bench, where in Mr. Gladstone's absence there is no longer any statesman possessed of recognised authority over the House of Commons or of commanding influence among the constituencies."

The *Daily Telegraph*, which had for some days warmly supported Mr. Chamberlain, and seemed in some degree to represent his individual views, wrote: "With diminished moral force and a weakened political influence—but with the support of Mr. Parnell, to whom his latest scheme has been submitted—Mr. Gladstone will, in less than a fortnight, undertake the most arduous of the many tasks of his life. Such an array of adverse influences never before confronted a Minister on the threshold of a great undertaking. But Mr. Gladstone is likely to be delighted in the tremendous perils of his task. We may be sure that Mr. Gladstone, deserted by some of his most trusted, ablest, and most influential colleagues, will rouse himself as on no former occasion to the great fight, and that, if 1866 be not memorable for anything else, it will be for the greatest personal effort of a long and illustrious career. Every resource of his experience and intellect will be required. The plan will be subjected from the first to the acute and impressive criticism of a group of Liberal debaters strong in every qualification for the task. It is certainly a clear gain that, owing to the defection of so many leading Liberals, the new measure, instead of arousing the bitter and obsolete taunts of stale party passions, will be discussed from a far more elevated point of view. The duty of the Conservative party in the present crisis seems to us to be very clear. They should not thrust themselves to the front of the fray. They should leave to the Liberal seceders the leadership of the resistance. Let them proclaim it on the housetops that, in whatever constituency the Conservatives are in a minority, they will vote as one man for any Liberal candidate—even were it Mr. Chamberlain, or Mr. Jesse Collings himself—who will uphold the Union. In fact, let their votes, regardless of party issues, be thrown for the triumphant return of a Unionist majority to the next House of Commons—composed of Liberals and Conservatives alike."

The *Daily News* had somewhat unaccountably allowed the secession of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan to pass without comment, as if hesitating between the two schools of Radicalism which now in keen rivalry were bidding for popular support. "Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan," it wrote, "are two of the most prominent of the rising statesmen to whom the Liberal party looks for leadership in coming years. In dissociating them-

selves from a Liberal Ministry at the present crisis they greatly increase its gravity. It is understood, however, that the attitude they will take up will not be one of hostility, but of friendly independence. We believe that the chance of a permanent settlement of the hereditary quarrel with Ireland is in the carrying of some form of Home Rule in the present Parliament. The opportunity seems to have come, and it is difficult to measure the responsibility which will attach to any who stand in the way of its acceptance. It may be now or never. The danger seems to be that amid conflicting schemes the issue may be confused, and the great occasion of reconciliation may be lost."

On the other hand, the *Standard* naturally saw in the situation a revival of the chances of a Coalition Ministry, of which it had on more than one occasion been the champion. It asked: "Deserted at once by the leader of the Whigs and the leader of the Radicals, what has Mr. Gladstone to fall back upon? What is the *tertium quid* which is still to do duty for the great Liberal party—supposed to be represented by the present Administration—now that these elements have been withdrawn from it? It is simply the personal following of Mr. Gladstone. The newly modelled Ministry will represent no party; neither the Whigs, the Moderate Liberals, nor the Radicals. Its mere existence is an open defiance of the party system which has flourished in this country for the last two centuries. The situation is indeed without a parallel, unless one may be found in the last and worst days of the Government of Sir Robert Walpole, when that Minister had driven from his side all the best statesmen of his party, and had come to rely exclusively on his own personal adherents, who did his bidding as a matter of course, and were as obedient to their patron as the great parasite in Juvenal. On all previous occasions when Mr. Gladstone has had the country with him he has had Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain with him too. These statesmen are great forces outside as well as inside the House of Commons. The public are not ripe for such a change as this, and will look to the seceding statesmen to make it an impossibility. Something more will be expected of them than a merely negative attitude. They must be constructive as well as critical; nor ought they to shelter themselves too carefully under the old plea that doctors do not prescribe until they are called in. Their first duty is to resist the attempt of the Prime Minister to ignore the pretensions of subordinate leaders to speak on behalf of the nation, and to centre all authority in himself."

Meanwhile the political atmosphere was thick with rumour concerning the scope of the coming Land Bill; and each day witnessed the production of some new scheme which served as the text for innumerable speeches and articles. Even the Scotch papers took alarm at some of the projects attributed with such assurance to the Government; and the Glasgow and Edinburgh *Liberals* seemed for a moment to be hesitating in their allegiance

Gladstone. But it was in a Lancashire borough that the al of strength between the two sections of the Liberal party lace. The vacancy at Barrow-in-Furness furnished an unity for restoring to the House of Commons Mr. W. S. who had been defeated in the Tottenham Division of sex at the General Election. His first address to the elec- Barrow had left the impression that he was disposed to neutral in the strife between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. erlain, although his own bias was in favour of Home He, however, refused to pledge himself in favour of adstone's Bill until he knew its scope and contents. This ion gave great offence to a section of the Liberals; and eeling ran so high that not only were Liberals invited to from voting in favour of Mr. Caine, but Irish members lown from town to town to speak against him, and a rival can- was brought forward, who, although nominated, retired as soon as the poll opened. Mr. Caine ultimately the seat on the basis of Mr. Chamberlain's Irish policy, spite of the abstention of the Gladstonian Liberals, d his Conservative opponent, Mr. Gainsford Bruce, Q.C., e times as large a majority as that by which the Liberal rried the seat in the previous autumn. Although the ish interest was powerful in Barrow, there was no evidence r that it had been actively exerted in Mr. Caine's behalf, any understanding had at that time been come to be- he Whigs and that section of the Radicals to which Mr. had attached himself. The death of Mr. W. E. Forster, long illness, by awakening unpleasant reminiscences, even more than the Barrow election to predispose public in England against an unconditional surrender to Ire- Mr. Forster, who had been regarded by the majority of low-countrymen as a patriot of the loftiest order, was to have differed wholly from the Irish policy towards the existing Government seemed pledged; and almost t occasion on which he had displayed an interest in was on the occasion of the unauthorised Home Rule during the recess. On that occasion he had from his sociated himself with the opinions expressed by Lord gton and Mr. Goschen; and it was thought by many of nds that the excitement produced by his action on this n had brought on a relapse, from which he never rallied. t as it may, the strongly expressed sympathy and ad- n for Mr. Forster's independence and singleness of purpose indisposed the public towards those views of passive ice which were being daily urged by the supporters of the y. Within the Cabinet itself, too, there was, up to the the production of the Bill, a serious difference of opinion, was only removed by Mr. Gladstone's consenting to modify ginal intentions. This difficulty arose out of the proposed

transfer of the Irish customs to the Statutory Parliament in Dublin—a point which it seemed Mr. Parnell had urged with great insistence, but which Mr. Childers, Sir Wm. Harcourt, and Mr. Mundella had strenuously opposed, on the ground that no guarantee could be given that the Irish Parliament might not at any time impose duties on British manufactures.

At length the day arrived (April 8) when, after more than one disappointment, Mr. Gladstone was to ask leave “to bring in a Bill to amend the provisions for the future government of Ireland;” and he promised after the interval of a week to introduce another Bill, “to make amended provision for the sale and purchase of land in Ireland.” The excitement in the House of Commons was far greater than out of doors. As early as six o’clock in the morning several members had arrived in order to put in their claims for seats; and, according to the rule of the House, they could not, without losing their rights, leave its precincts until the sitting had commenced. By eleven o’clock every seat except those on the Treasury and front Opposition benches had been secured, the greatest eagerness throughout having been displayed by the Irish Nationalist party, which from the earliest hour mustered almost in its full strength, and throughout the evening its enthusiasm never flagged. When Mr. Gladstone rose to unfold his plan there was not an inch of available space for the crowd of privileged persons who vainly hoped to get within earshot of the Prime Minister. As an effort of oratory, however, it was admitted even by his warmest admirers that Mr. Gladstone’s speech was wanting in the glowing rhetoric, the fervent appeals and bitter denunciations which had marked many of his most celebrated addresses. He commenced by expressing regret that it was not possible for him to open the whole Irish question on this occasion, because Ministers entertained the unalterable conviction that the government of Ireland and the land question were inextricably connected, and were the only channels to that social order which all desired. The Government, he said, had come to the conclusion that it was the duty of Parliament no longer to fence with the Irish question, but to come to close quarters with it, and their intention was to make proposals which they believed would restore to Parliament its liberty of action, and would test whether it were not possible to establish good relations between Great Britain and Ireland. Proceeding to lay a foundation for this attempt, he dwelt first on agrarian crime, which he described rather as a symptom, and on the coercive legislation by which it had been met, and which he showed had been habitual. Of the agrarian crime he also said—provoking loud cheers from the Irish members, and murmurs from other parts of the House—that had the same causes existed in England and Scotland similar results might have followed; and in regard to coercive legislation, he maintained that if *it was to be* resorted to again, which after the refusal of the late

Government to renew the lapsed Crimes Act, he held to be impossible, it must be of a very different character from the timid coercion of former years, and enforced in a different spirit. And if there were to be resolute coercion, he said, it could only be successful with autocracy of government and secrecy of public transactions; and such coercion, he asserted, would never be resorted to by the people of England and Scotland until they had tried every other alternative. But had they tried every alternative? and answering this question, Mr. Gladstone was again met with loud cheers from the Irish members, when he asserted that we had never tried the alternative of stripping law in Ireland of its foreign garb, and investing it with a domestic character. Ireland had never enjoyed a right to make her own laws. The considerations which compelled an attempt to deal with this state of things were, first, the fact that it did not conduce to the unity of the Empire, and, next, the necessity of doing something to restore social order and liberty in Ireland. The problem to be solved he defined to be, how to reconcile Imperial unity with diversity of legislation; and it was a problem, he said, which had been solved by ourselves before the Union, and by other countries in circumstances more difficult than ours. Dilating on this point, he described at length the legislative arrangements of Sweden and Norway and Austria-Hungary; but what he had to propose, he said, was not a repeal of the Union, because the essence of the Union was that before it there were two co-ordinate and independent Legislatures. Neither would it involve dismemberment or disintegration, or any absurd talk of that kind. Then, after examining the alternatives, especially that of recasting the Executive, which would not content the Irish, he stated, amid loud cheers from the Irish members, that the Government intended to propose the establishment of a legislative body to sit in Dublin to legislate for Ireland and to control Irish administration. There would be securities for the unity of the Empire, and adequate protection for the minority, among whom he included all those interested in land, the civil servants and other persons concerned in the government of the country, and what is called the Protestant minority. The mention of the minority led him to discuss various suggestions which had been made for the special treatment of Ulster—none of which, he said, had commended themselves to the Government—though they were ready to consider favourably any proposals which might be made and which might seem practicable. Passing to details, he first dealt with the question—Are the Irish Peers and the Irish members to remain in the British Parliament?—and he concluded, chiefly from the impossibility of distinguishing between Imperial and local functions, that they could not be allowed to come to Westminster after the establishment of an Irish Parliament. Then with regard to taxation, he said the general power of imposing taxes would pass to the new legislative body, with the exception



of customs duties and excise duties connected with Customs ; but the balance of these duties, after providing for the payment of Irish obligations, would be paid into the Exchequer, and would be at the command of the legislative body. Next, having described the securities which would be taken against any tampering with this “Magna Charta of Ireland” in the absence of her representatives, he dwelt on the powers of the new legislative body. The Bill would have complete control over the Executive Government as well as the Legislature ; but the legislative body would be subject to all the prerogatives of the Crown, it would not be able to pass any legislation affecting the Crown or its devolution ; all that relates to defence—the army and navy, &c.—would be out of its province ; it would have no concern with foreign or colonial relations, and it would be prohibited from establishing or endowing any religious body. As to the composition of this legislature, Mr. Gladstone said it would consist of two orders with a power of separate voting when desired, and a veto of one order on the other, to last for three years or until the next dissolution. The first order would consist of the twenty-eight Representative Peers and seventy-five other members elected for a period of ten years by persons of 25*l.* a year qualification, and possessed of a property qualification of 200*l.* a year. The second order would consist of the present 103 university, county, and borough members, with 101 others added, elected in the same manner for five years. As to the Executive, it would remain as it was for the present, subject to any changes which might be worked out by the new legislative body ; the Viceroy would remain in the same position, assisted by a Privy Council ; he would not go out of office with the Government, and the present religious disability would be removed. Those of the present judges who desired it would be able to demand a retiring pension. As to the constabulary, which now cost a million and a half per annum to maintain, he said it would remain for the present under the same terms of service, and under the same authority. There would be no breach of continuity with regard to it, but the British Consolidated Fund would contribute to its support anything it might cost over a million. Eventually the Irish Legislature would have charge of its own police. The civil servants, after two years, would be able to claim a discharge on the terms usual when an office was abolished.

Mr. Gladstone then went on to explain the financial aspects of the new arrangement, and to discuss the proportion of Imperial charges which Ireland should pay. At the time of the Union it was intended that her share should be 2-17ths of the entire charge of the United Kingdom ; but for various reasons, which he adduced, Mr. Gladstone considered that the Bill would propose a proportion of 1-14th as “an equitable or even a generous arrangement.” This contribution would be paid by *Ireland* out of a fund composed in the first instance of the entire

receipts paid into the Irish Exchequer; but this would not give a true test of the amount of taxation paid by Ireland, inasmuch as by the flow of duty-paid commodities from Ireland to Great Britain upwards of 1,400,000*l.* paid by the British taxpayer would form part of the Irish receipts. This enormous gain to Ireland, if trade were allowed to take its free course, would practically result in reducing the contribution of Ireland from 1-14th to 1-26th. This benefit, moreover, could not be taken away from her without breaking up the absolute freedom of trade between the two countries. The incidence of taxation under this system would, Mr. Gladstone argued, remove what he considered to be actually prejudicial to Ireland. The contribution of each inhabitant of Great Britain to the entire expenditure was 2*l.* 10*s.* *per capita*, or of Ireland 1*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.*, which he maintained to be obviously and inequitably high for Ireland. On the new basis, however, which the Government proposed, the respective contribution *per capita* to what would henceforward be regarded as "imperial expenditure" would be 1*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.* for Great Britain, and 13*s.* 5*d.* for Ireland. Mr. Gladstone then, in the form of an "Irish budget," went on to show the operation of his proposal: 1-15th of the annual debt charge would amount to 1,466,000*l.* of the army and navy charge, excluding "war votes and volunteers," 1,666,000*l.*, and the amount of civil charges, 110,000*l.*; making a total charge properly imperial of 3,242,000*l.* To meet this the Customs in Ireland produced 1,880,000*l.*, the Excise 4,300,000*l.*, stamps 600,000*l.*, income-tax 550,000*l.*, and non-taxed revenue, including the Post Office, 1,020,000*l.*; making a total of 8,350,000*l.* To the above shown expenditure of 3,242,000*l.* there would have to be added 1,000,000*l.* for the constabulary, 2,510,000*l.* for civil charges, and 834,000*l.* for the cost of the collection of the revenue. On all these, however, Mr. Gladstone anticipated that large savings might and would be effected by a responsible Irish Government. Finally, Mr. Gladstone urged the necessity, in view of ultimate borrowing, that Ireland should be able to show that she had made provision for meeting her old obligations before she incurred new ones, and consequently he proposed to set aside 750,000*l.* of her income annually for the creation of a sinking fund. This would result in a total charge of 7,946,000*l.*, against a total income of 8,350,000*l.*, or a surplus of 404,000*l.* Turning to the more general aspects of the question, Mr. Gladstone next referred to past endeavours to give Ireland good laws—some passed grudgingly, others generously, but neither producing the desired result because proceeding from a foreign and alien source. He gave a brief survey of the history of the Land Question from the year 1870. Comparing the position of Ireland with that of the Colonies (when fifty years previously he had occupied the post of Under-Secretary), Mr. Gladstone said that the persistent reply of *the Colonies* was, "We do not want your good

of customs duties and excise duties connected with Customs ; but the balance of these duties, after providing for the payment of Irish obligations, would be paid into the Exchequer, and would be at the command of the legislative body. Next, having described the securities which would be taken against any tampering with this "Magna Charta of Ireland" in the absence of her representatives, he dwelt on the powers of the new legislative body. The Bill would have complete control over the Executive Government as well as the Legislature ; but the legislative body would be subject to all the prerogatives of the Crown, it would not be able to pass any legislation affecting the Crown or its devolution ; all that relates to defence—the army and navy, &c.—would be out of its province ; it would have no concern with foreign or colonial relations, and it would be prohibited from establishing or endowing any religious body. As to the composition of this legislature, Mr. Gladstone said it would consist of two orders with a power of separate voting when desired, and a veto of one order on the other, to last for three years or until the next dissolution. The first order would consist of the twenty-eight Representative Peers and seventy-five other members elected for a period of ten years by persons of 25*l.* a year qualification, and possessed of a property qualification of 200*l.* a year. The second order would consist of the present 103 university, county, and borough members, with 101 others added, elected in the same manner for five years. As to the Executive, it would remain as it was for the present, subject to any changes which might be worked out by the new legislative body ; the Viceroy would remain in the same position, assisted by a Privy Council ; he would not go out of office with the Government, and the present religious disability would be removed. Those of the present judges who desired it would be able to demand a retiring pension. As to the constabulary, which now cost a million and a half per annum to maintain, he said it would remain for the present under the same terms of service, and under the same authority. There would be no breach of continuity with regard to it, but the British Consolidated Fund would contribute to its support anything it might cost over a million. Eventually the Irish Legislature would have charge of its own police. The civil servants, after two years, would be able to claim a discharge on the terms usual when an office was abolished.

Mr. Gladstone then went on to explain the financial aspects of the new arrangement, and to discuss the proportion of Imperial charges which Ireland should pay. At the time of the Union it was intended that her share should be 2-17ths of the entire charge of the United Kingdom ; but for various reasons, which he adduced, Mr. Gladstone considered that the Bill would propose a proportion of 1-14th as "an equitable or even a generous arrangement." This contribution would be paid by *Ireland* out of a fund composed in the first instance of the entire

receipts paid into the Irish Exchequer; but this would not give a true test of the amount of taxation paid by Ireland, inasmuch as by the flow of duty-paid commodities from Ireland to Great Britain upwards of 1,400,000*l.* paid by the British taxpayer would form part of the Irish receipts. This enormous gain to Ireland, if trade were allowed to take its free course, would practically result in reducing the contribution of Ireland from 1-14th to 1-26th. This benefit, moreover, could not be taken away from her without breaking up the absolute freedom of trade between the two countries. The incidence of taxation under this system would, Mr. Gladstone argued, remove what he considered to be actually prejudicial to Ireland. The contribution of each inhabitant of Great Britain to the entire expenditure was 2*l.* 10*s.* *per capita*, or of Ireland 1*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.*, which he maintained to be obviously and inequitably high for Ireland. On the new basis, however, which the Government proposed, the respective contribution *per capita* to what would henceforward be regarded as "imperial expenditure" would be 1*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.* for Great Britain, and 13*s.* 5*d.* for Ireland. Mr. Gladstone then, in the form of an "Irish budget," went on to show the operation of his proposal: 1-15th of the annual debt charge would amount to 1,466,000*l.* of the army and navy charge, excluding "war votes and volunteers," 1,666,000*l.*, and the amount of civil charges, 110,000*l.*; making a total charge properly imperial of 3,242,000*l.* To meet this the Customs in Ireland produced 1,880,000*l.*, the Excise 4,300,000*l.*, stamps 600,000*l.*, income-tax 550,000*l.*, and non-taxed revenue, including the Post Office, 1,020,000*l.*; making a total of 8,350,000*l.* To the above shown expenditure of 3,242,000*l.* there would have to be added 1,000,000*l.* for the constabulary, 2,510,000*l.* for civil charges, and 884,000*l.* for the cost of the collection of the revenue. On all these, however, Mr. Gladstone anticipated that large savings might and would be effected by a responsible Irish Government. Finally, Mr. Gladstone urged the necessity, in view of ultimate borrowing, that Ireland should be able to show that she had made provision for meeting her old obligations before she incurred new ones, and consequently he proposed to set aside 750,000*l.* of her income annually for the creation of a sinking fund. This would result in a total charge of 7,946,000*l.*, against a total income of 8,350,000*l.*, or a surplus of 404,000*l.* Turning to the more general aspects of the question, Mr. Gladstone next referred to past endeavours to give Ireland good laws—some passed grudgingly, others generously, but neither producing the desired result because proceeding from a foreign and alien source. He gave a brief survey of the history of the Land Question from the year 1870. Comparing the position of Ireland with that of the Colonies (when fifty years previously he had occupied the post of Under-Secretary), Mr. Gladstone said that the persistent reply of *the Colonies* was, "We do not want your good

laws; we want our own." Ireland had now adopted a similar standpoint. "We stand," continued Mr. Gladstone, "face to face with what is termed Irish nationality. Irish nationality vents itself in a demand for separate and complete self-government in Irish, not in imperial, affairs. Is this an evil in itself? Is it a thing that we should view with horror or apprehension? Is it a thing which we ought to reject or accept, or ought we to wait until some painful and sad necessity is incumbent upon the country, like the necessity of 1780 or the necessity of 1793? Sir, I hold that it is not. . . . I hold that there is such a thing as local patriotism, which in itself is not bad, but good. The Welshman is full of local patriotism; the Scotchman is full of local patriotism; the Scotch nationality is as strong as it ever was, and should the occasion arise—which I believe it never can—it will be as ready to assert itself as in the days of Bannockburn. I do not believe that that local patriotism is an evil. I believe it is stronger in Ireland even than in Scotland. Englishmen are eminently English, Scotchmen are profoundly Scotch, and, if I read Irish history aright, misfortune and calamity have wedded her so to her soil. The Irishman is more profoundly Irish, but it does not follow that because his local patriotism is keen he is incapable of imperial patriotism."

Mr. Gladstone refused to admit that his scheme was merely the choice of the lesser of two evils—on the contrary, he maintained that it was rather a good in itself. He declared his conviction that the Irishman was as capable of loyalty as any other man, as their service in the army and the constabulary amply testified. On this point he refrained from dwelling. "However this may be," he continued, "we are sensible that we have taken an important decision—our choice has been made. It has not been made without thought; it has been made in the full knowledge that trials and difficulty may confront us on our path. We have no right to say that Ireland through her constitutionally chosen representatives will accept the plan I offer. Whether it will be so I do not know—I have no title to assume it—but if Ireland does not cheerfully accept it, it is impossible for us to attempt to force upon her what is intended to be a boon; nor can we possibly press England and Scotland to accord to Ireland what she does not heartily welcome and embrace. There are difficulties, but I rely upon the patriotism and sagacity of this House; I rely upon the effects of free and full discussion; and I rely more than all upon the just and generous sentiments of the two British nations. Looking forward, I ask the House to assist us in the work that we have undertaken, and to believe that no trivial motive can have driven us to it—to assist us in this work which we believe will restore Parliament to its dignity, and legislation to its free and unimpeded course. I ask you to stay that waste of public treasure which is involved in the present system of governme



and legislation in Ireland ; and which is not a waste only, but which demoralises while it exhausts. I ask you to show to Europe and to America that we too can face political problems which America twenty years ago faced, and which many countries in Europe have been called upon to face, and have not feared to deal with. I ask that we should practise what we have so often preached in our own case with firm and fearless hand—the doctrine which we have so often inculcated upon others—namely, that the concession of local self-government is not the way to sap or impair, but the way to strengthen and consolidate, unity. I ask that we should learn to rely less upon merely written stipulations, and more upon those better stipulations which are written on the heart and mind of man. I ask that we should apply to Ireland that happy experience which we have gained in England and in Scotland, where the course of generations has now taught us, not as a dream or a theory, but as practice and as life, that the best and surest foundation we can find to build upon is the foundation afforded by the affections, the convictions, and the will of the nation ; and it is thus by the decree of the Almighty that we may be enabled to secure at once the social peace, the fame, the power, and the permanence of the Empire.” Mr. Gladstone’s speech had lasted nearly three hours and a half, and, although less brilliant than some of his speeches on previous occasions, it had moved deeper feelings on all sides than many of his more elaborate orations. Throughout its delivery it had been loudly cheered by the Irish Nationalists ; and on its conclusion it was not less vigorously assailed by the Ulster Protestants, who urged in various tones that Parliament could not honourably carry out the proposed scheme. But after Mr. Gladstone’s unfolding of his views, the interest of the evening was centred in Mr. Trevelyan and Mr. Parnell. The former, who rose as soon as the House began to refill, explained his reasons for joining the new Cabinet, which, with few exceptions, was identical with that which had quitted office in the previous summer. One member only (Mr. Morley) had pronounced himself in favour of Home Rule, and almost all adversely to it. His view was that, if those Liberals who were opposed to Home Rule and to handing over law and order in Ireland to those whom they had often described as the enemies of law, were to stay out of the Liberal Cabinet, that would voluntarily be making a confession that the Liberal party was a Home Rule party. That confession was one which, until every faculty he had was strained to the uttermost, and every constitutional method inside and outside the House had been exhausted, he for one could never consent to. Knowing the opinions which his colleagues had held, he thought they would “ knock the measure about in the Cabinet, as Cabinets do, and mould it into accord with what had been their relative opinions, and which were his now.” But he was disappointed in his expectations. He did not know whether he had chosen

the better part; but of this he was certain—that he had chosen the most unpleasant one. His own views with regard to the maintenance of law and order in Ireland had been definitely expressed in a speech he delivered in Warwickshire before he joined the Government, whose proposals now were utterly inconsistent with the declarations he had then made.

To the proposed scheme he objected that the judges would be dependent on an elective Parliament, and would stand almost alone in supporting the old ideas of law and order against a sea of sentiment of a very different nature. Even now it was only a very brave judge who would do his duty under very trying circumstances in Ireland. The constabulary would, as a police be a moribund force, and would be simply part of the British garrison; and a garrison could not do police duty. At any moment the new Parliament could set up a civil police. The reason why Lord Spencer left behind him a hateful memory was that he vindicated law and order. “I ask (he said) hon. gentlemen to say whether in their heart of hearts they feel justified in committing to a Parliament actuated by such feelings the charge of tracking out and punishing crime, of discouraging the disorderly classes, and of encouraging and keeping in countenance quiet people who ask nothing of the Government except the privilege of going about their business in peace without injuring their neighbours. . . . All of us were of one mind in June last; in that month—and I am not telling a Cabinet secret, because, to the best of my recollection, the Prime Minister announced it to the world—we were unanimously resolved, some, perhaps, reluctantly, to support Lord Spencer in asking for the renewal of some provisions of the Crimes Act, which might, perhaps, be terrible to bad citizens, but which I am quite certain would not have made any good citizen uncomfortable. What has happened since that time? What has happened since the day when we all opposed Home Rule?” It was true that Mr. Parnell had eighty-six members at his back. But it was well known that even under the old franchise he could not have less than seventy-six.

It was the very fact that the Nationalists were so numerous that made Mr. Trevelyan hesitate to trust them with more power for, by the laxity of its attitude towards crime, the National party had not established such a title as would justify Parliament in handing over to it the lives, the property, and the freedom of Ireland. Referring next to the attitude of a certain portion of the Press, and of the caucus and its organs, Mr. Trevelyan added:—

“Those of us who have protested silently and most respectfully against the introduction of this Bill—for hitherto we have not said one single word in public—have been threatened on all sides with the extinction of our political careers, and I must say *that my sense of political morality was much shocked by the*

fact that nine-tenths of the newspaper correspondents, in referring to my action, that of Mr. Chamberlain, and that of Lord Hartington, have discussed it, not as a question of right or wrong, but as to the effect it will have upon our future political career. Upon a question like this who cares for career, and who cares for one's political future? There are other careers open to honest and industrious men, and if there is no other career open to us there is open to us the career of a private citizen who has not got it upon his conscience that he gave over to the tender mercies of a separate Parliament in Ireland, in which men like Sheridan and Egan are pretty sure to be prominent members, the law-abiding citizens of the country."

Mr. Trevelyan then went on to state in detail his objections to the Government scheme. There was no precedent, he declared, which would hold water for having a police force not dependent on the Central Government. In the land scheme to enable landlords to "flee from the wrath to come" he saw insuperable difficulties, and he protested against the payment of half a million to one duke and three-quarters of a million to another marquess because they happened to be landlords; whilst the doctor, the clergyman, the sheriff's officer, the process-server, and the witnesses in the old trials would be left to remain without any protection or compensation whatever. He doubted, moreover, the realisation of Mr. Gladstone's scheme of finance, the mathematical precision of which left out of consideration not only Irish human nature, but human nature itself. He declared that all attempts to limit the subjects which the Irish Parliament might discuss would be futile, and that no paper bonds would keep Irish members from discussing foreign or colonial questions or passing resolutions which would hamper the Imperial Government. "Separation is preferable to such a course. Then we should know where we are at once, whereas now we shall come to it through a vista of bad blood and quarrels between the two nations which will greatly embitter us. And if we embark on this course we may just as well come to a separation once for all."

In conclusion, Mr. Trevelyan declared that the basis of an alternative scheme should be the maintenance of law and order in Ireland by the Central Government in the hands of Ministers responsible to Parliament at Westminster. "If you do this, it will enable you to do what nothing else will enable you to do—namely, to dispose of without solving the absolutely insoluble problem of buying out the landlords. At the same time, in the interests both of Ireland and of the British taxpayer I would make freely elected Irish local bodies responsible for education, higher, middle, and lower, for the superintendence of local government, for poor relief, and for the development of the resources of Ireland in every respect. These bodies should have all the powers *that now lie with the Imperial Parliament or the*

Lord-Lieutenant for the arrangement of railway, tramway, canal, and harbour Bills. To all these bodies I would allot with a generous hand, and once for all, their share of the produce of the taxes, so as to make them responsible for the local finances of Ireland, and what remain over and above should be raised, as in England and Scotland, by local taxation. To these bodies should be committed full powers of local administration and local taxation, but they should have no executive power, or power over valuation and assessment, in order that injustice should not be done indirectly between class and class."

Mr. Parnell at once followed, and by means of a bitter personal attack on Mr. Trevelyan skilfully attempted to draw away attention from the latter's criticism of the Ministerial scheme. He protested against any idea of sympathy with the "assassination literature," either of America or of Ireland, with which Mr. Trevelyan had attempted to connect the Nationalist party. If violent things were written in *United Ireland* and elsewhere, it was because the people were desperate, and had nothing to lose, but if given a constitution they would do nothing to risk it. Mr. Parnell then went on to pay a warm tribute to Mr. Gladstone for having "lent his voice on behalf of poor, helpless Ireland," and devoting "his great mind and his extraordinary energy to the unravelling of this question and to the construction of the Bill." Whatever might be its fate, the cause of Ireland, the cause of Irish autonomy, would enormously gain by the genius of Mr. Gladstone. The two principal objections which Mr. Parnell saw in the Bill, and which he should attempt to remove in Committee, were the surrender of the customs and the control of the police. He declined to admit the justice, and still less the liberality, of the standard of comparison on which Mr. Gladstone based his calculations. He held that one-twentieth was a far truer standard of the relative share of the two countries than the one-fifteenth selected. He thought it, moreover, most unfair that the people of Ireland should be called upon to contribute to the support of a police over which they had no control. To the proposed vote "by order" in the Irish Parliament and the suspensory power accorded to the upper Chamber, Mr. Parnell was also opposed, on the ground that by such a more or less permanent obstruction would be created, and the means of bringing about a deadlock would be placed in the hands of a body of members which could scarcely be called representative. "As regards the measure itself," he concluded, "the Prime Minister has truly said that it ought not to proceed unless it is cheerfully welcomed, not only by the Irish members, but by the Irish people. I quite agree in that proposition, and I am convinced that if our views are fairly met the result of this Bill will be to agreeably disappoint Mr. Trevelyan and all those who think with him, that it will be cheerfully accepted by the Irish people as a solution of the *long-standing* dispute between the two countries, and that it

will lead to the prosperity and peace of Ireland and the satisfaction of England."

Mr. Plunket was the only member of the front Opposition bench who spoke on this occasion. In a short but effective speech he exposed the uselessness of the supposed checks, and of the impossibility of enforcing respect for them. The Parliament to be established by the Bill would be more independent than Grattan's Parliament, for from 1782 to 1800 the affixing of the Great Seal of England was necessary to the enactment of any measure passed by the Irish Parliament.

Mr. Chamberlain having moved the adjournment of the debate, it was known that when the House next met the reasons for his withdrawal from the Cabinet would be explained, and the interest in the proceedings was scarcely less keen than on the previous evening. He opened his speech by stating that, although his resignation and that of Mr. Trevelyan had been only accepted within the previous fortnight, more than a month had elapsed since they had been originally tendered. The assertion that he had joined the Government with a preconceived determination to leave it on the first opportunity was not only untrue, but ridiculous. It was difficult for him to reconcile himself to a separation from one whom he had followed for many years, and from political associates with whom he had no other cause of difference whatever. The issue, however, now before them was vital—and private feeling, personal friendship, political ambition, and the cherished objects of a public life must be put aside. Mr. Chamberlain then referred to the circumstances under which he had originally joined the Ministry. After expressing his doubts whether he could give any support to the intentions which common report had attributed to Mr. Gladstone, the latter assured him that he had not up to that day formed any definite plans; that he had only committed himself to inquiry, and that all he asked his colleagues was to join with him in an inquiry as to how far it was or was not practicable to meet the wishes of the Irish people as represented by the large majority of its representatives. After describing his own ideas as to the nature of the securities which he considered indispensable, Mr. Chamberlain went on to say that he did not believe it would be found possible to conciliate those limitations with the establishment of a separate and politically independent Parliament in Dublin. Mr. Gladstone, however, saw no reason that, holding such views, Mr. Chamberlain should not join the Cabinet. Upon this Mr. Chamberlain put his views in writing in a letter which he then read to the House:—

"40 Prince's Gardens, S.W., Jan. 30, 1886.

"My dear Mr. Gladstone,—I have availed myself of the opportunity you have kindly afforded me to consider further your offer of a seat in your Government. I recognise the justice of your view *that the question of Ireland is paramount to all*



others, and must first engage your attention. The statement of your intention to examine whether it is practicable to comply with the wishes of the majority of the Irish people, as testified by the return of eighty-five representatives of the Nationalist party, does not go beyond your previous public declarations, while the conditions which you attach to the possibility of such compliance seem to me adequate, and are also in accordance with your repeated public utterances. But I have already thought it due to you to say that, according to my present judgment, it will not be found possible to reconcile these conditions with the establishment of a national legislative body sitting in Dublin, and I have explained my own preference for an attempt to come to terms with the Irish members on the basis of a more limited scheme of local government, coupled with proposals for a settlement of the land, and perhaps also of the education question. You have been kind enough, after hearing these opinions, to repeat your request that I should join your Government, and you have explained that, in this case, I shall retain 'unlimited liberty of judgment and rejection' on any scheme that may ultimately be proposed, and that the full consideration of such minor proposals as I have referred to as an alternative to any larger arrangement will not be excluded by you. On the other hand, I have no difficulty in assuring you of my readiness to give an unprejudiced examination to any more extensive proposals that may be made, with an anxious desire that the results may be more favourable than I am at present able to anticipate. In the circumstances, and with the most earnest hope that I may be able in any way to assist you in your difficult work, I beg to accept the offer you have made to submit my name to her Majesty for a post in the new Government.—I am, my dear Mr. Gladstone, yours sincerely, "J. CHAMBERLAIN."

Mr. Chamberlain went on to explain that he had never been opposed to Home Rule for Ireland as defined by himself, and up to that time also by Mr. Gladstone, who had always upheld the supremacy of Parliament. Possessed with the belief that no greater change had taken place in Mr. Gladstone's definition of Home Rule than in his own, Mr. Chamberlain joined the Ministry; and it was not until March 13 that the new definitions of the Prime Minister were mentioned in the Cabinet. It was then brought forward in connection with a land purchase scheme involving the issue of 120,000,000*l.* Consols. At this point Mr. Gladstone suddenly interfered, and a most painful altercation took place in public between two statesmen who had hitherto worked together in harmony.

Mr. Gladstone insisted that the explanation which he had obtained permission from her Majesty for Mr. Chamberlain to make had no reference to any scheme for the sale and purchase of land which had not been made public, and to enter on that

question before the introduction of the Bill would be unprecedented, and would lead to serious misconstruction. Mr. Chamberlain thereupon retorted that he had obtained Mr. Gladstone's leave to read a particular letter of March 15, which went into the subject fully, but Mr. Gladstone did not admit this, and finally, on Mr. Chamberlain now asking permission to read it, the Prime Minister again said that to refer to a Bill which had not been introduced would be highly irregular.

Mr. Chamberlain said this placed him in a difficult position, because he had resigned, not merely on the Home Rule question, but on the land question, and he objected to the scheme as a whole and to each part of it. He objected to the Home Rule scheme because it terminated the Irish representation in that House, and placed Irish members in so degrading and comparatively powerless a position that, whatever they might profess themselves ready to agree to now, Ireland, he felt convinced, would never submit to it. In a caustic and searching criticism of the Bill, and especially of its financial aspects, he showed that it must lead to future agitation, ill-feeling, and ultimate separation; and rather than accept it he would vote at once for total separation. As to the purchase scheme, though in favour of a liberal measure, he objected to lay a heavy additional burden on the British taxpayer simply to provide a bribe for the landowners to acquiesce in separation. He denied that coercion was the only alternative, pointing out that the Bill could not be carried out except by coercing the Protestants, and argued that Imperial unity, accompanied by the desired local national government, could be attained on the lines of federation, rather than on the lines of colonial self-government adopted by the Government.

The effect and original scope of Mr. Chamberlain's speech had been crossed and marred by Mr. Gladstone's persistent refusal to allow his former colleague's explanation to travel beyond the exact letter of a permission which no one had seen but himself; but, in spite of this, it had been well received on all sides except by the Irish Nationalists. From them the interruptions became more noisy and frequent as Mr. Chamberlain proceeded. By the Conservative Opposition he was as warmly applauded as he was silently listened to by his late colleagues. It was not, however, until he reached the end of his speech that in a few words he marked the deep and impassable gulf which he had dug between himself and them, and foreshadowed the rise of that group which was to hold in its hand the destiny of at least one Administration. Turning to the Treasury Bench, Mr. Chamberlain concluded :—

“ Sir, there are some persons, servile partisans who disgrace political life, who say that I have been guilty of treachery because I have resigned an office which I could no longer hold with honour. What would these men have been entitled to say if, holding the *opinions that I do*, which I expressed before joining

the Government, and which I have expressed to-day, I had remained on that bench pretending to serve my country with a lie upon my lips? I do not assume, Heaven knows I do not pretend, to dogmatise on a question of this kind. I do not say that I am right in the conclusion at which I have arrived; I do not presume to condemn those who differ from me; but of one thing I am certain—that I should have been guilty of an incredible shame and baseness if I had clung to place and office in support of a policy which in my heart I believe to be injurious to the best interests of Ireland and Great Britain.”

Mr. T. Healy was put forward by the Irish Nationalists to reply to Mr. Chamberlain; and he displayed no lack of zeal in his task. The main point of his sarcasm was directed against Mr. Chamberlain's newly found support on the Conservative benches, and he ridiculed the idea of his being able to induce his new allies to follow him in his ideas on the land question and education. Mr. Healy did not object to federation as proposed by Mr. Chamberlain, but he failed to see how it could be attained unless there was some local government to be federated. After refuting the objections to the financial propositions contained in the Bill, he congratulated Mr. Gladstone upon the message of peace he had brought to the Irish people.

Sir J. Lubbock, speaking against the Bill, contended that its supporters would have been very few but for the influence of the Prime Minister, and regretted that the question had not been put fully and fairly before the country at the General Election. His chief criticisms were directed to the economic dangers of the measure. He attributed the restlessness and discontent of Ireland largely to her poverty, and anticipated a further deterioration in her physical condition if the Bill were carried. Irish Railway Stocks, he pointed out, were already from 15 to 20 per cent. lower than English Railway Stocks of the same kind; which was due chiefly to the uneasiness as to the future. As to the analogy which Mr. Gladstone had assumed in the case of Austria-Hungary, Sir John Lubbock showed that not only were the conditions of Ireland and Hungary wholly different, but that the existing dual Empire did not work well, in spite of the Austrian Emperor's personal energy.

But the most important speech of the night was Lord Hartington's, in which he explained at length the reasons which had led him and his friends to stand aside when Mr. Gladstone was forming his Administration. These reasons were founded on the conviction that the task which Mr. Gladstone had undertaken could not be reconciled with the opinions they had previously expressed, and still entertained. The policy of the late Liberal Government entailed on them the open and avowed hostility of the Parnellites, and at the General Election they had placed themselves before the country as pre-eminently the friends of the maintenance of law and order in Ireland. They felt, he

said, that the policy of examination and inquiry into the Irish question, which was the fundamental basis of the Government, must lead to results for which they could not make themselves responsible, consistently with the opinions they had always professed, and still held. Their standing aloof was justified, he contended, by the retirement of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan the moment that policy of examination and inquiry began to be converted into action. Touching next on the difficult position in which Parliament and the Liberal party had been placed by Mr. Gladstone's course, he maintained that the Liberal party had gone to the country as the especial defenders of law and order in Ireland, and he showed that in Mr. Gladstone's address there was not a sentence to lead the country to suppose that he contemplated any such measure as this. The country had no warning at all that any proposals of this magnitude were to be considered in this Parliament; and, though the principle of a mandate was unknown to our Constitution, he asserted that Parliament had no moral right to deal, especially as its first task, with questions which had not been submitted, but might have been submitted, to the constituencies. If this question had been submitted to the electors it was not altogether impossible that the Conservatives might have found themselves in a majority. As to what had happened since the meeting of Parliament, he confessed that Mr. Gladstone's speech on the Address had filled him with much uneasiness, but the Prime Minister's action since had not even been consistent with his own declarations.

"The careful avoidance of my right hon. friend of any declaration in favour of the maintenance of the legislative union, the repudiation of the existence in our Constitution of any fundamental laws, and the general tone of the speech of my right hon. friend led me, and many of us, to believe that my right hon. friend had intentions, at any rate, of a very wide and far-reaching character. My right hon. friend said he should reserve his own judgment, that he should listen with attention to what hon. gentlemen opposite had to propose, and, above all, that he should listen to what might be urged by hon. members representing the great majority of the Irish people. Now, has the course taken by my right hon. friend been altogether consistent with the spirit of these declarations? My right hon. friend did not wait to hear the proposals of hon. gentlemen opposite. He took the very earliest opportunity of ejecting hon. gentlemen who now sit opposite from office. (Mr. Gladstone: "After the notice.") My right hon. friend says after the notice. (Mr. Gladstone: "Coercion.") But my right hon. friend did not wait to hear any reasons which might be urged by the late Government in support of their proposals, and the notice appeared to have been a sufficient intimation to my right hon. friend. Has he waited to listen to what might be urged by the members representing the majority of the people of Ireland? No, sir; I have never heard those

members formulate their demands, or tell my right hon. friend what it is that they have been sent to Parliament to ask for. My right hon. friend has anticipated their demands by undertaking an examination and inquiry into that which he believed, but which he does not know, at all events from Irish members, to be the express desire and wish of the Irish people. The necessity, in his view, of ejecting the late Government and of dealing with this question himself without the slightest delay was so paramount that it has altogether overweighed that danger which in Midlothian he felt so keenly. What is the result? The result is that we have before us the concession which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues are prepared to make to what my right hon. friend believes, but does not know, to be the declared wish of the majority of the Irish people. I cannot avoid saying that I think the Government have taken upon themselves a tremendous responsibility."

Lord Hartington went on to argue with great power and clearness that the Bill now introduced would henceforth be the minimum of the Irish National demand—the starting-point and vantage-ground of whatever proposals they might afterwards bring forward. It would remain on record as that which a great Minister had proposed, not in response to any formulated demand of the Irish representatives, but as what he himself thought a reasonable concession to justice to offer to the Irish people. Lord Hartington then passed on to examine the historical argument by which the scheme had been introduced, contending that it would restore not Grattan's Parliament, but a condition of things which he would have been the first to refuse; and, canvassing the alternatives, he asserted that it was not local self-government, but entire separation and independent legislation, which the Irish desired. As to the foreign examples on which Mr. Gladstone had relied, he denied that there was any resemblance to this case in any one of them. Some further explanations were required, he thought, as to the veto and the position of the constabulary; and of the scheme generally he said that if it were good for Ireland it would be good for Scotland and Wales, and if they demanded it the absurdity would follow that the English House of Commons, deprived of Scotch, Irish, and Welsh members, would be not only a domestic and local Legislature, but the Imperial Legislature controlling alone the whole Imperial policy of the Empire. The Sovereignty of Parliament would cease to be real, and the Bill provided no machinery by which the central authority might be vindicated. The power of the veto was not even reserved to the Imperial Parliament or the Imperial Government; and as for the suggested maintenance of the prerogatives of the Crown, Lord Hartington asked if the power of veto, which had fallen into disuse, by the Crown over the Acts of the Imperial Parliament was going to be revised or created over the Acts of the domestic Legislature of



Ireland. After touching on the anomalous, if not impossible, rôle assigned for two years to the Irish constabulary, he showed what was the logical outcome of such exceptional legislation.

"It is plain that if this is good for Ireland it must be good for England, Scotland, and Wales. If Scotland or Wales demand that this plan should be extended to them I do not see how that demand can be possibly refused. Supposing they make the demand, what would be the resulting state of things? We should have in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales domestic Legislatures. They would have full control over their own affairs. So far very well. We should have in England a domestic Legislature also, with full control over English affairs; but we should, in addition to this, find this House, from which every Irish, Scotch, and Welsh member was excluded, having full Imperial control over the whole of the Empire. All the foreign policy of the Empire, all the colonial policy, all the Indian policy of this Empire would be controlled by representatives of English constituencies alone. I should like to ask, What would Scotch members say to such a scheme? Would Scotchmen like to be excluded from all control over foreign and colonial affairs whatever? I say they would repudiate it. Why, it would be degrading to them. It would be unfair financially to the Irish, Scotch, and Welsh people that they should contribute to the expense of foreign policy when they should have no voice whatever in controlling it. It would be as unfair to ask Scotland and Wales to pay contributions under those circumstances as it would be now to ask England alone to pay the expense of warlike enterprise."

Lord Hartington then went on to argue that if the Imperial Parliament at any time should have to enforce respect for its decrees by the army, of which it was to remain sole master, the inevitable result would be to call in civil war as the sanction of the proceedings of Government. In view, moreover, of the closely existing relations between the two countries—relations which would not be severed on the passing of this Bill—many occasions would be forthcoming for serious differences. He maintained in opposition to Mr. Gladstone that it was quite possible to combine remedial and repressive legislation in such a way that the Irish nation should have no valid reason for complaining of being made the object of exceptional and disabling laws. The present crisis had been aggravated by the reckless use of the word "coercion," but if laws were just he urged that they should be maintained, and if they were unjust they should be repealed without the creation of a domestic Legislature, and we could not escape our responsibilities by handing over the administration of the law to hands which we knew would not use it in a manner different from that in which we should apply it ourselves. In conclusion, Lord Hartington said, in reference to previous failures: "I admit that there has been great difficulty—and perhaps there has been

failure—in the government of Ireland; but, sir, I think that it is not altogether due to the causes alleged by my right hon. friend, and the doctrine that the Irish people do not understand law which comes to them in a foreign garb may not perhaps on examination be found to hold water. There are other causes for the failure of our system of government in Ireland, and among them has been the fact that Irish questions and the government of Ireland have too long and too habitually been made the battle-ground of political parties. The question of Irish order has been too often subordinated to what I have no doubt has been honestly thought at the time to be interests of a superior or more pressing character. But, sir, I do not admit that because this has been so it must always be so. If, indeed, this be a necessity, I am afraid no alternative does lie before us but either an ultimate resort to civil war or an abandonment at once of our duties, our privileges, and our responsibilities. But, sir, I refuse to believe it. Now that the people of this country have been brought face to face with the alternative of the disruption on the one hand, or all the evils and calamities which I admit will follow on the rejection of this unfortunate scheme, I believe that now, at all events, the people of this country will require that their representatives shall in relation to Irish affairs agree to sink all minor differences, and to unite as one man to hand down to our successors the great empire, compact and complete, as we have inherited it from our forefathers, and at the same time to maintain throughout its length and breadth the undisputed supremacy of the law.”

The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. J. Morley), in closing the debate for the evening, first addressed himself to Lord Hartington's contention that the measure would entirely disintegrate the Empire. He insisted that Parliament would remain perfectly competent to repeal it as soon as it was passed; and, as regards the Irish constabulary, he pointed out that it would still continue under the direct control of the Lord-Lieutenant. Touching upon his own personal part in the change of policy adopted by the Government, he went on to say :—

“The debate to-night has been, we must admit, in some respects a painful one. It would to me be very painful if I had thought during the last autumn, when I took some modest part in the campaign which ended in the election of this Parliament, that the first time when I should have to claim the indulgence of the House to hear me should find me vindicating my position against that of my oldest comrades in political arms. But the occasion has come. They admit, as I contend, that this is a crisis and these are issues when private considerations must yield, and when, with whatever pain, we must each and all of us take the positions which our consciences commend to us. *If we in this assembly were all united in a common desire and*

by a common sense of public necessity, the problem of how to build up social order in Ireland is so complex and so entangled that it would tax the highest powers of the ablest men in all quarters of the House to ensure a solution of it. If you think of the economic difficulties, of the religious difficulties, of the curious perversities of the geographical mixture of religion and races in Ireland, and if you measure all these gigantic obstacles, you will see how terrible the task is to weld all these elements into a corporate whole and stable society. But we are not united when we confront not one or two but three parties, and when our own party is divided and subdivided, and the party opposite will be very different from what it was at the end of the last Parliament, if it is not at least as much divided."

Mr. Morley then referred to what Mr. Trevelyan had termed the assassination literature of America, and, whilst unwilling to make too much of the "dark and subterraneous forces" by which it was nourished, he expressed his firm conviction that in rejecting the establishment of a domestic Legislature in Ireland the House of Commons would be doing exactly what those desperadoes with dynamite and dagger most desired, and that the only alternative would be a Government of stern repression. Mr. Chamberlain's scheme he described as the most extraordinary one for a statesman of such eminence to propose. To pass a suspensory Act for six months, during which Irish landlords were to have their rent lent to them out of Imperial money, did not show much tenderness for the British taxpayer, whilst with regard to his scheme of federation, the state of Ireland would not wait till it could be framed and adjusted. He did not believe that the Land League could be suppressed without having recourse to measures before which every practical statesman would recoil; and if the measure were rejected he anticipated a lawless cessation of the payment of rent. After pointing out the inconsistencies and vacillations of our policy towards Ireland, and calling upon Mr. Goschen to state how he would rescue Parliament from its chaos of policies, Mr. Morley explained his reasons for regarding the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament as a cardinal point of policy.

"They do not look at Imperial topics and interests from the same point of view as we do; they do not assist us in the manner in which it is essential that counsellors in this Parliament should at least endeavour to do so. If this adjustment is successful—if, after years of experiment, the result is what we desire and expect—it may be possible enough that our successors may invite Irish representatives back again. But what I wish to point out is that those who make a great point of having Irish representatives in this assembly are those who would refuse to Ireland a domestic Legislature. But what would the effect of that be? You would have here a body of men who came here in a spirit of irritation and resentment because that had no

granted to them, and who would not easily forgive those who had balked them, and that spirit of irritation and resentment would have been deepened and heightened by what has happened now. If I were about to refuse a domestic Legislature to Ireland I should be the more anxious to keep Irish gentlemen away from this assembly, because those who have to-night spoken in favour of denying the national demands of Ireland have yet insisted upon keeping Irish members here, and this is to give to those whom they have irritated and filled with resentment the best opportunity and the strongest position they can for dealing the deadliest blow at the Legislative business of this country and the authority of this Parliament. Therefore I am unable to understand the arguments of the noble lord and of the right hon. gentleman the member for Birmingham, who make it such a point in their policy that those whom they wish to refuse in their demands should remain here to be a source of mischief and dissension and inefficiency in this Parliament."

The interest in the third night's (April 12) debate was confined to the speeches of Lord R. Churchill, the Attorney-General (Sir Charles Russell), and Mr. Whitbread.

Lord R. Churchill, renewing the debate, asserted that but for the authority of the Prime Minister such a mass of contradictions and absurdities as this Bill presented never would have been seriously considered. The fanciful safeguards and guarantees with which it bristled were every one, he maintained, futile and useless; and, illustrating this in detail, he said that ancient and modern history equally failed to supply any precedent for the composition of the new Irish Parliament, and, above all, he ridiculed as reactionary, and discarded, the machinery of a property qualification, which he showed would not protect the minority. Of the arrangement for customs and excise he said it amounted to this—that the Irish party sold for 1,400,000*l.* to the British Parliament and the British Government the right of a free people that representation and taxation should go hand in hand. It also sold the Irish Parliament's power of the purse, and under this arrangement the Irish Executive might carry on the government without ever calling the Irish Parliament together. For the accuracy of this financial calculation they had only the Prime Minister's statement, yet the revenue must be of the most precarious character, liable to be affected by the importation of spirits into Great Britain, by temperance legislation, and by other causes. Another effect would be that the customs duties in Great Britain would be stereotyped, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would find his hands tied. As to the principle of the Bill, it was repeal; and, quoting the Act of Union, he ridiculed the contention that the Bill only modified it. If he were an Irishman he said he should feel degraded by a proposal which would not trust the Irish Parliament to deal *with some of the most important points which could come before*

a Parliament. Next he examined the various grounds on which the Prime Minister had recommended his Bill, contending that they were all inadequate. On the argument derived from the return of 86 Parnellite members, he remarked that Irish parties had never hung long together, and that Mr. Parnell was aware of this he augured by the written pledge he had obtained from his nominees. He repudiated strongly the "law in a foreign garb argument," pointing out that this was the character of the Emancipation Act, of the Land Acts, and other Acts, and that this particular Act would be thus regarded. Referring to the attitude of the Chief Secretary, which he admitted was fully justified by all his public utterances, he severely criticised his suggestion that the failure of the Bill would result in crime and outrage, but insisted that this ought not to influence the House in its decision. His own impulse would have been to challenge a division on the motion to introduce the Bill, but he had waived his opinion in deference to others; and he declared his intention at a later period of recording his vote against a policy which, in his opinion, had been most unconstitutionally sprung upon an unwary and unwarned House of Commons.

The Attorney-General (Sir Charles Russell) twitted Lord R. Churchill with having no alternative policy. In a retrospect of its history he contended that the Act of Union had not conferred upon Ireland any real benefit, while Grattan's Parliament, he showed, was followed by considerable prosperity and improvement in the welfare of the Irish people. The Act of Union, he pointed out, was protested against by all classes in Ireland, including the Ulster Orangemen; while even Lord Grey, Lord George Cavendish, and Mr. Fox had condemned it. He recalled the numerous repressive measures which had been put in force in Ireland since 1780, contending that the failure of Irish legislation was due to the fact that it had always been what England thought was needed, and not what Ireland wanted. Touching upon the question of the inclusion of Irish members in the House of Commons, Sir C. Russell went further than any previous speaker on the Ministerial bench: "For my part," said he, "I should be sorry to see, if any one can suggest a practicable method of avoiding it, Irish members cease their attendance in the House." If the Bill were passed, though the Union would be modified, it would not be destroyed, for the paramount authority in relation to Imperial matters in Ireland would still remain in the British Parliament. Dealing with Lord Hartington's speech, he maintained that not only was the question before the country at the General Election, but that the scheme of the Bill was well within the lines of Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian declaration:—

"The question is no longer whether the thing is to be done, but whether it is to be done now and in what form. And when the justice and the *practicability* of such a scheme as this is



recognised by a responsible Cabinet—when the dissentient Liberals dissent only as to the mode, the degree, and the time—when the Conservatives have no policy, no alternative to this, but a policy of repression, is it not right that this measure shall be passed in a generous spirit, and passed in a way which is likely to attain its object? If passed now in a generous spirit, I think there is a strong probability that it will be received by Ireland in a thorough spirit of friendliness, and that in Ireland matters will moderate and arrange themselves. Postpone it until there is military repression or repression of some other sort, and the thing will still have to be done; but it will have to be done under conditions infinitely worse, accompanied by greater international embitterment between races and classes in Ireland, and with diminished hopes of complete international friendliness. Sir, I have spoken with earnestness because I feel deeply on this subject, and I ask hon. members, even if they do not approve in all details the scheme of the Prime Minister, whether they do not think that, instead of belittling this question, the Prime Minister has placed it on a higher plane and in a purer atmosphere, and has propounded a scheme that was at least worthy of the great subject he dealt with? I believe that in this scheme will be found the means of ending a state of things which is intolerable—intolerable to Ireland, intolerable to England, injurious to the name and fame and greatness of this empire. It is, sir, because I believe that this happy result may be attained by this scheme, if rightly considered and dealt with, that with all the earnestness of which I am capable I ask for it from this House and from the country a fair, an honest, an anxious, a dispassionate, and a generous consideration.”

Mr. Whitbread's speech was the more important because of the high respect in which he was held, and because it was almost the only speech made by an independent English member in support of the measure. He based his argument in favour of passing the Bill chiefly on the ground that the offer having been once made it could not be withdrawn. He contrasted the various alternatives which had been suggested by Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Chamberlain, and others, and dismissed as untenable and impracticable Lord Hartington's idea of a combination between parties to resist the Home Rule demand, and warned the House of the obstruction which the Irish members would bring to bear to stop all business if such a coalition were formed. He did not understand that the exclusion of the Irish members was a fixed point in Mr. Gladstone's plan, but he could see that they might have ample work on their hands in settling their country without taking any Imperial responsibilities on their shoulders at present, though they might desire it hereafter.

On the other hand Mr. Gibson, who, although now representing an English constituency (Liverpool, Walton Division), was *still regarded as the mouthpiece of the Irish Conservatives outside of Ulster*, denied the position taken up by the Chief Secretary.

that there was no alternative to the Bill except coercion. He argued, moreover, that it could not be a final settlement to the question, and prophesied that if it passed full separation would ultimately be demanded. He protested energetically against Irishmen being described as foreigners, and, referring to other "dangerous remarks" of Mr. Gladstone, reproached him with not at once giving to Ireland complete instead of a sham independence. He urged also that the security given to the minority was illusory, and, in conclusion, declaimed against the Bill as being altogether inadequate to effect its object.

The closing night of the debate (April 13) was chiefly noteworthy for the strong way in which Mr. Goschen, speaking evidently in the name of the Whig party, emphasised the differences which separated them from the supporters of the Bill. The debate had been resumed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir W. Harcourt), who, admitting the justice of the claim for a definition of Home Rule, furnished it by quoting a passage from the "Radical Programme," originally published in the *Fortnightly Review*, which he attributed to Mr. Chamberlain, but which that gentleman, amid much laughter, emphatically disclaimed. Next he examined in detail the alternatives suggested by Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Hartington. The central bodies plan and the federation plan of the first two were not only irreconcilable with each other, but were even condemned by Lord Hartington and were repudiated by the Parnellite members. As to Lord Hartington's evident desire to return to a *régime* of mingled coercive and remedial measures, he pronounced that impossible. It had been killed by the course of the late Government on their accession to office, which had made Home Rule inevitable. Lord Spencer himself was convinced that it was impossible, and he believed that Lord Carnarvon was of the same mind. As to the policy of the Opposition, although it was vague, the suppression of the League was their policy when they went out of office, but he put it pointedly to Mr. Chamberlain whether he would join in a policy of this kind. The more the alternatives were examined the more certain it became that there was no alternative but coercion, and to carry out a policy of coercion a strong and harmonious Government would be necessary, backed by a strong majority in and out of the House. Canvassing the chances of such a Government, he pointed out to Lord Hartington that his dream of a non-party Administration had failed in the hands of Lord Chatham and had been denounced by Burke, whose description of it, he said, reminded him of a Loyal and Patriotic Meeting at an Opera-house. He himself refused to believe in such a millennium. Finally, he enlarged on the danger of rejecting this Bill, and, while he admitted that he was not entirely free from misgiving, he pointed out that if the Irish Parliament should prove unworthy of the gift it might be resumed with the unanimous con-

sent of the British people, and with the consenting conscience of Europe.

Mr. Goschen, who immediately followed, began by depreciating the banter and personalities of the Chancellor of the Exchequer which he maintained, though they had amused the House, but led it away from the real point, and complained that he had made no reference to the financial proposals embodied in the Bill. He expressed alarm at the doctrine that Home Rule must be given because 86 members had demanded it, and asked what would be the freedom of England and Scotland if it was acknowledged that whatever the members for any particular district asked for must be granted. Examining the details of the Bill and pointing out that the difficulty was agrarian as well as national, he laid stress upon the fact that in all the analogies which had been drawn the national point alone had been recognised, and the social condition of the people entirely overlooked. The analogy between Ireland and Sweden and Norway or Austria-Hungary, he pointed out, had already been shown to be erroneous, and as regarded the colonies it equally failed, because in them, where there was boundless land, there was no such agrarian difficulty. Dealing with the proposed exclusion of Irish members from the English Parliament, he accepted the doctrine of the Prime Minister that it would be impossible for Irish members to sit in the House of Commons to interfere in English and Scotch business while Englishmen and Scotchmen had no voice in Irish affairs, and he warned the House of the danger of giving Irish members control over English and Scotch affairs under such conditions. He next glanced at the constitution of the proposed Irish Parliament, which he prophesied would never continue long; and having asked for further information as to the power of veto which the English Parliament would have over Irish legislation, he touched upon the proposed administrative changes, which he characterised as a most gigantic revolution. He emphasised the serious risks which, he contended, must undoubtedly ensue from them in connection with international questions, and especially drew attention to the immense difficulties which the new Irish Executive would have to encounter from foreign conspirators, who would flock to Dublin from the Continent and America. Turning to the fiscal question, he considered the customs to be an insoluble difficulty, and argued that an Irish grievance would be created whenever taxation was increased. Strongly condemning the undecided manner in which Ulster was dealt with, he pointed out to the Irish members that if they lost Ulster they would lose a large portion of their taxable area, inasmuch as Ulster contributed to Schedule D of the income tax of Ireland—excluding Dublin—no less than 45 per cent, and the four predominantly Protestant counties contributed 2,220,000*l.*, while the other Ulster counties contributed only 300,000*l.* He asserted, moreover, that when Ireland obtained her

separate government, she would be unable to find money or credit for that material development for which she was so anxious. Turning to another aspect of the question, he asked the Irish members if they were prepared to hand over national education to the Roman Catholic Bishops, and whether Liberal members would support such a proposal. At the same time he boldly asserted, amid the cheers of the Home Rulers, that the Prime Minister would not carry his Bill if he put a clause into it which would hamper the Irish Parliament in dealing with education. Proceeding to refer to the new electors, he remarked that the Attorney-General said that at all events the constituencies had given no mandate for coercion; but was it necessary for the country to give a mandate to an Executive Government that it should maintain the law? "I condemn the principle of a separate national Parliament in Ireland on the ground which I have placed before the House, irrespective of any measure that can possibly be introduced. If we should be able to approach this matter and these problems in a spirit of peace, then I do not see why alternative schemes should not be proposed. But one cardinal point which ought to lie at the basis of these schemes is that they should be applicable to Ireland, Scotland, and England. I should call remedial measures increasing that which the Attorney-General calls parochial—increasing the powers of local government in Ireland on a large and not a parochial scale. But the establishment of a central political body in Dublin will sap the foundations of local life in Ireland, because it will be overruled by this central political body. I would far sooner build up in Ireland throughout the localities local and municipal bodies than in the first place have a central body which must be political from the circumstances of the case. What is wanted in the management of Irish affairs is clearly that vacillation should cease, and that there should be some belief that England sometimes pronounces a last word. We shall give way now, as we have given way before, and check after check will vanish, until the Irish have done that which they desire to do—establish Ireland as a separate nation."

Sir M. Hicks-Beach hoped the Bill would be judged on its merits, and not on the authority of the Prime Minister. It was no light matter, he contended, that at the time other nations were consolidating their resources, and our colonies were adopting or discussing confederation, a contrary policy was proposed for this country. In no part of Great Britain was there a vestige of popular sentiment in favour of this Bill, although he admitted there was a feeling in favour of it in Ireland. The plan had pulverised the unity of the Liberals, and it certainly was an extraordinary mode of restoring social order to intrust the destinies of Ireland to men who had been denounced as the disturbers of the public peace. If the Prime Minister had not changed his opinion of the Parnellites, this measure was nothing but black-

mail. He denied that the measure was an alternative for coercion inasmuch as it would not settle the question, and would not satisfy the demand, which was really one for national independence. Dealing with the fiscal question, he argued that a scheme which did not give to the Irish Parliament entire control over Irish taxation would be satisfactory to the Home Rule party. They had accepted the present proposals as an instalment only and he had no doubt that hereafter they would use them as a weapon to secure complete national independence. Turning to the Irish members, he asked them how they could for a moment suppose that the national independence of Ireland was secured by the Bill. "Ireland is to have no power whatever over the succession to the Crown. She is to have nothing to do with the army and navy of the empire; she is to have no control over foreign or colonial affairs; Irish members are to be absolutely deprived of all that in which certainly they have taken hitherto a very intelligent and powerful interest, and to which they seem to me to have quite as much right as the inhabitants of any other part of the United Kingdom. In return for that they are to receive less than the local liberties which are granted to the smallest self-governing colony, and are to pay, what the colonies do not, an annual tribute of no inconsiderable amount to the Imperial Exchequer."

Sir M. Hicks-Beach then went on to discuss the position of Ulster under the Bill. If that province were excluded from its provisions, he could not see how a statutory Parliament could be established in Ireland; if, on the other hand, it were included, it would mean the most terrible oppression of the minority by the other three provinces of Ireland; and he added: "I fear it would also mean resistance to the authority of the Irish Government in Ulster. It is because I believe that this Bill would in no way be a final or real settlement of the question between England and Ireland that I feel it is no real alternative to the policy of coercion which the Chancellor of the Exchequer declines to adopt. Coercion must come some day unless Ireland is to be separated from England. As far as we are concerned, we adhere to the declaration which we placed in the mouth of her Majesty in the most solemn way in our power. The National League is undoubtedly a dangerous and formidable organisation; but it is not more dangerous or more formidable than was the Catholic Association in the time of Mr. O'Connell. Firmness and patience have dealt with these matters before, and they will deal with them again."

Mr. Gladstone then rose to sum up the debate and to answer the various criticisms which had been levelled against the Bill. He maintained that the argument on which he had based his proposal of 1871 was that no case had at that time been made *out to justify the remodelling of any of the institutions of the country generally or the breaking up of the Imperial Parliament*



and he owned that at one time, after the Church Act of 1865 and the Land Act of 1870, he did cherish the hope that we might be able, by legislation, to meet the wants and the wishes of Ireland. He had then stated in the most explicit manner that he had heard with joy the assurance that the demand which was beginning to be made by Mr. Butt for Home Rule did not involve in any way the disintegration of the empire. "It is said I have shown mistrust of the Irish Legislature by providing safeguards for minorities. I have already stated in the most distinct terms that the safeguards provided, as far as I am concerned, are not in consequence of mistrust entertained by me, but they are in consequence of mistrust entertained by others. They are reasonable precautions by way of contribution on our part to disarm the honest though unfounded jealousy, and, however little it may appear that they are likely to attain their end, yet I cannot regret that we have made them. With respect to the foreign garb of English laws, I have used those words not with respect to the beneficial acts which have been done on many occasions by this Parliament for the purpose of meeting the wants of Ireland, but with regard to the ordinary operations of the criminal law in that country, especially in association, as it has constantly been, with the provisions of special repressive or coercive legislation." As to his not having a formulated demand from Ireland, he remarked that the Duke of Wellington had a pretty well formulated demand: "If it be a just and reasonable demand, we cannot hasten too soon to meet it; and we will not wait until the day of disaster, the day of difficulty, and I will add the day of dishonour to yield, as we have so often yielded, to necessity that which we were unwilling to yield to justice."

Replying to appeals and criticisms on details, he said he had never laid down the future exclusion of the Irish members as an essential and vital portion of the Bill, but while he could not bind himself or his colleagues to accept any of the suggestions which had been made, he said it would be presumptuous at this stage to close the door against consideration of this question. Mr. Goschen's objections, he observed, were based entirely upon the assumption that Ireland would always do wrong. This he indignantly repudiated; and next, adverting to the question of the income-tax, he pointed to Indian income-tax, which was entirely independent of this country, to show the fallacy of Mr. Goschen's strictures. Replying to the complaint that the question of Home Rule had not been before the country, he argued that if a mandate were not required for a policy of coercion, much less was it needed for a policy tending to cement the union between the English and Irish people. He accepted the argument of Mr. Healy that federation was practically impossible without the existence of a local government, and contended that among the *opponents of the Bill there was a decided want of common feature, common action, common purpose, common principle; there was*

no united basis of action except the basis of hostility to this Bill. Mr. Gladstone concluded: "When I speak of this plan I speak of it as a plan in its essence, and not in its detail. It may derive much advantage from the wisdom of Parliament. It has been produced and brought to light under a degree of pressure such as I believe never was applied by circumstances to any Government, such, at least, I will venture to say, there is no case of in the half-century to which my recollection extends. It may be improved by the wisdom of this House; but, speaking of it as a plan, I say it holds the field. It has many enemies; it has not a single rival. And, sir, it is safe to prophesy that the subject will continue to hold the field. Many who are here advocate important reforms; many think, and I am one of them, that legislation is in arrear. The demands upon your time and thought are beyond your capacity even with your best exertions to meet. But, sir, you may dismiss all these subjects from your mind until the matter is disposed of, until the Irish problem is solved. I am not speaking of what gentlemen opposite may threaten or say; I am looking at the nature of the case; I am looking at the profound interest of the whole English and Scotch people—ay, and of the whole civilised world. Until this problem is solved it is idle to think of making real progress with the business of this country in respect to the important subjects which are perfectly ripe for the handling of Parliament. We have come to the time for decisive action; we have come to the time for throwing aside not only private interests and partial affections, but private device and partial remedies. We have come to the time for looking at the whole breadth of this subject and endeavouring to compass it in our minds, when we must answer this question—whether we will make one bold attempt to free Parliament for its great and necessary work and to establish harmony by Irish laws for Ireland, or whether we will continue, on the other hand, to struggle on as we have done before, living from hand to mouth leaving England and Scotland to a famine of needful and useful legislation, and Ireland to a continuance of social disease the depth of which we have never understated, of social disease that you do not know how to deal with, and which, in angry discord with great Britain, you make no attempt to cure." Leave was then given to bring in the Bill; the second reading was, by an unfortunate oversight—subsequently remedied—fixed for the anniversary (May 6) of the murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke.

It has been necessary to give at some length the views of the principal speakers on the Ministerial scheme, for in these speeches was shadowed forth that combined opposition which was ultimately to overthrow Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet. Outside Parliament the Government of Ireland Bill seemed to find even more qualified support than from its apologists in the House of Commons. From the very outset the *Times* placed itself in the front

line of opposition to a proposal based on the disruption of the empire, and the detriment of Ireland. "The scheme," it wrote (April 9), "is in substance a proposal to place Ireland not in the position of one of the States of the American Union, but in that of Canada or any other of the self-governing colonies. No time is to be lost, no pains ought to be spared, in bringing before the popular mind the consequences of this disastrous offer. The forces of resistance are powerful; we hope and believe they will be triumphant." On the following day the same journal wrote: "Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme already stands decisively condemned by the public opinion of the country. The emphatic verdict of independent thinkers of every class and shade of opinion is that it will not do. The newspapers which are recognised as representing the Scotch people reject his scheme with practical unanimity as mischievous and impracticable. In the metropolitan press it is approved only by one humble and indefatigable admirer. In Manchester and Birmingham, which give their names to two great schools of Liberal thought, and are the headquarters of the two great Liberal organisations, the scheme meets with a condemnation which other important provincial centres repeat. Mr. Gladstone has indeed outrun the most daring surmises. His scheme is an astonishing patchwork of clippings from a variety of more or less successful constitutional experiments, each of which has grown up in obedience to a peculiar set of conditions. Mr. Gladstone's patchwork combines all their disadvantages, and naturally misses all their benefits. His mass of details, resting on no solid foundation, has the same relation to practical politics that one of Jules Verne's novels has to serious science."

And again, a day later (April 12), it summed up from its own point of view the popular verdict: "It is impossible even for the most devoted of Ministerialists to ignore any longer the feelings of repugnance and alarm which Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme has aroused throughout the whole country. He appealed exclusively to the alarm inspired by the threats of the Irish Separationists and their allies beyond the Atlantic. We do not believe that his cause is served by thus addressing the fears rather than the higher instincts of Englishmen. Mr. Morley's performance apparently failed to produce a favourable impression even upon his Irish allies. Even before the Bill is in print Parliamentary criticism may be said to have killed it. There is no security that it will not be revived unless public opinion decisively condemns it and casts it out. The country must be invited to take part in that 'examination and inquiry' which Mr. Gladstone professed to initiate, and which he has endeavoured to evade by a bold stroke of surprise. Happily, however, there is no longer any room for doubt as to the judgment of the country on a project which, if the Prime Minister were not habitually secluded from contact with the wholesome air of public criticism, and if he

had not separated himself from all his former colleagues except those consenting to be puppets of his will, could never have been laid before Parliament." The *Standard* said immediately after the introduction of the Bill: "Not the least striking feature of the Ministerial measure is its omissions. The absence of any special provision for Ulster is the first thing that condemns the Bill. The crucial question was simply postponed, the Cabinet agreeing to go fishing for a policy upon it. The whole argument of the Prime Minister's speech was vitiated by an incapacity to face plain facts. Even if it included all the guarantees, in which it is glaringly deficient, what prospect of peace would it give us? It would, in our judgment, rather enhance than diminish the dangers of the future. The scheme is doomed; it is a message of discord, not of peace." The *Daily Telegraph*, once so warm a supporter of Mr. Gladstone, now took the line of strenuous opposition. "He has proposed," it wrote, "the most extraordinary, the most unwelcome, the most revolutionary step ever submitted to the British Parliament. The Irish members are to quit Westminster practically for ever. Therefore Ireland will have no influence on the selection or support of our Ministers in our foreign policy or in our wars. So far she will cease to be a part of the empire, and will become, in fact, a colony, with some disadvantages and many restrictions. Every point of the new treaty between the two countries will form a subject for perpetual strife between England and Ireland." On the following day, and after indicating the new leader it had elected to follow, the *Telegraph* wrote: "It is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Chamberlain's remarkable speech left the elaborate legislative structure erected by the Prime Minister on the previous evening in a heap of ruins. The force and brilliancy with which Mr. Chamberlain proceeded to expose these fatal weaknesses in Mr. Gladstone's scheme will be appreciated, so far as a mere report can render such appreciation possible, by readers of his speech this morning. Every blow told; every shot went home. It was a speech which everyone who heard it must have felt to have sealed the doom of the Prime Minister's ill-starred scheme. Lord Hartington explained his refusal to join the Government in a speech of remarkable dignity and weight. For reply we have what? We have so long striven in vain with the difficulties of Irish government that it is high time to think of political suicide. That is the sum and substance of Mr. Morley's reasoning."

And after the Bill had obtained its first reading the *Telegraph* resumed: "Mr. Gladstone may at least be awarded this dubious praise—that he is not above profiting by hostile criticism. His speech of last night, in answer to Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, at the winding up of the debate on the first reading of his Home Rule measure, disclosed some very important modifications in the Ministerial scheme. He is now willing to allow Irish members to come to Westminster, their exclusion—in spite of the argu-

ments employed when his introductory speech was made—‘not being a vital part of the scheme.’ The point is to be ‘left open for further consideration,’ and every politician knows what that portends. On the other Mr. Gladstone has also discovered that the retention of Customs and Excise by the Imperial Parliament is ‘not essential to his plan.’ This is an innovation on his original proposals of a very insidious and dangerous character. The effect of the two modifications, taken together, is that, while Imperial unity is preserved to a certain extent, the fiscal unity of the kingdom is abandoned. If Sir William Harcourt’s speech, where it was not dangerous, was flippant, Mr. Goschen, who immediately followed him, rose both in matter and tone to the true dignity of the great occasion. The Bill itself has to be finally and peremptorily dismissed, in the full confidence that, even if no substitute were directly available, it can never be good politics to accept a thoroughly unsound and unworkable measure.”

The *Daily Chronicle*, which had been gradually coming to the front rank among the London daily journals as the organ of the more robust and working-class Liberals, was not less strong in its condemnation of the Government Bill. “Mr. Gladstone has initiated a revolutionary movement in Anglo-Irish politics. As his scheme was unfolded it seemed to throw the occupants of the Liberal benches into the silence that comes of stupor rather than surprise. When he sat down the only applause he got consisted of Hibernian yells of delight and some sporadic cheering from the Radical benches. As for the rest—why, the rest was silence. The lesson history teaches us is not that which Mr. Gladstone has learnt. When the Government of Ireland has failed, it has not failed because it was just and firm, but because it was just without being firm, or being firm without being just.” And on a later occasion: “The natural difficulty is to criticise the details of a scheme the whole basis of which is believed to be rotten. But Mr. Chamberlain was not satisfied with proving that Mr. Gladstone has embarked on board a radically unsound vessel; he pertinaciously pointed out one by one its innumerable leaks. If the measure can withstand such a scathing attack as this, there can be no limit in human imagination to the legislative capacities of Parliament. The foundation of Mr. Gladstone’s argument is most fallacious, and when it is removed the whole edifice tumbles to the ground. As a piece of keen, merciless criticism, Mr. Chamberlain’s speech could hardly be rivalled. With a few exceptions he touched upon all the important points in a scheme bristling with details, and his course was strewn by the broken fragments of the Prime Minister’s scheme.”

On the point of taking an immediate division on the first reading, which was mooted in certain quarters, and was supposed to be especially supported by Lord Randolph Churchill, the *Chronicle* spoke more unreservedly than its contemporaries:



“The opponents of the Ministerial policy are on the eve of committing themselves to a false position by failing to meet the first reading of the Home Rule Bill by a flat negative. We cannot but agree that this course is imperative, if there is any sincerity in the opposition to the principles on which the Bill is based. To meet Mr. Gladstone's Bill with scathing, destructive criticism, which proves that it is a Bill which would dismember the empire, and then to read it a first time without a division, is to deceive the democracy as to the gravity of the situation.”

On the other hand, the *Daily News* alone among the London daily papers was prepared to defend the measure as delineated in Mr. Gladstone's opening speech: “In its broad principles,” it wrote, “it is well calculated to ease the fears sedulously excited, and will prepare the public mind for a calm and rational consideration of what is perhaps the greatest problem ever presented for its consideration. So far from handing Ireland over to the National League, this scheme may, on the contrary, be charged with handing the National League over to the middle classes and the aristocracy. In the matter of taxation, however, the proposed Irish Government will enjoy a far larger authority than the States of the American Union. The people of England, Wales, and Scotland will see in it the crowning effort of a great statesman to settle the most difficult and dangerous controversy of the time.” It as favourably interpreted the impression made upon the House as the majority of its contemporaries saw in the attitude of the various groups more than half-disguised opposition. On the second day after the introduction of the Bill it wrote: “The favourable impression immediately made upon the House of Commons by Mr. Gladstone's exposition of his scheme for the future government of Ireland is confirmed by the more detailed study the lapse of a day has allowed. There are many important points of difference between the position of Ireland under Mr. Gladstone's measure and that of any of our self-governing colonies. It is, indeed, difficult to discover any real points of resemblance, except of a superficial kind, between the relation proposed to be established between Great Britain and Ireland and that which exists between the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies. The one point of resemblance which has probably misled hasty critics is that the colonies are not represented in the Parliament at Westminster, and that it is proposed that the Irish representation shall cease. But even this resemblance is more apparent than real.” But this optimism scarcely survived eight-and-forty-hours, for on the following day (April 12) the same Liberal organ wrote: “It rarely happens that a statesman charged with the carriage of a great measure finds himself in difficulties so grievous as those which just now environ Mr. Gladstone. Deserted by some of his most valued colleagues, he apparently lacks that support of the public voice

which he has in former times found his great encouragement, invariably presaging success. It is a fact, the significance of which it would be idle to deny, that at the present crisis it would be difficult to get up a mass meeting in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. We are constrained to admit our conviction that the country is not yet ripe for Home Rule in Ireland. But we do not conceal our belief that, though the measure may pass its second reading, it cannot, unless a remarkable change take place in public opinion, become law this session. It would be far better to abandon Mr. Gladstone's Bill altogether than so to emasculate it that it shall fail to gain the general approval of the Irish people." But on the first reading passing without more than a formal challenge, the hopes of the Liberal group, of which the *Daily News* had become the mouthpiece, declared, after describing Sir William Harcourt's speech as one of the best debating speeches that statesman had ever addressed to the House of Commons: "The issue before the nation is—Mr. Gladstone's scheme or none. So far as we understand Mr. Goschen, he would have none. His speech was an admirable example of the inconsistencies and absurdities in which the opponents of Home Rule are involved. But the most important and significant part of Mr. Gladstone's speech was that in which he declared that he had never regarded the exclusion of the Irish members as vital. He had said that the present representation could not continue, but that the exclusion must be the voluntary work of Irishmen themselves. He made no pledge as to any change in the Bill in this respect, but merely promised that the door should be kept open to suggestions to be discussed hereafter. His eloquent reply to Mr. Goschen forms one of the most striking features of the whole debate. Never has he spoken with more energy, and rarely with more kindling force."

On turning from the London to the provincial daily press the division of opinion, even amongst the Liberal organs, was more equal. Manchester, Newcastle, and Birmingham; Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, and Aberdeen, all protested against a scheme which was based upon the exclusion of the Irish members from the Imperial Parliament. But Leeds, York, Bradford, Cornwall, and South Wales spoke through their press in favour of this proposal, although other portions of the Bill were less in accordance with their wishes. For instance, the *Leeds Mercury*, whilst unable to regard with favour all the provisions of the Bill, thought on the whole that Mr. Gladstone had been singularly successful in his precautions against possible abuse of power by the Irish Parliament. The *Mercury*, nevertheless, soon afterwards joined the ranks of those who regarded the retention of the Irish members as vital. The *Liverpool Post* also could not bring itself to believe that Mr. Gladstone's scheme would be accepted as it stood. Of course, all the recognised Conservative papers throughout the country found abundant scope for attack, but it was note-

worthy that in Scotland the two principal Liberal organs—the *Scotsman* and the *Glasgow Herald*—were found leading an almost united chorus of adverse criticism.

The *Scotsman* wrote: "Mr. Gladstone's Irish Government scheme will not do as it stands. It has admirable features, but as it stands it is a severance of Ireland from Great Britain in regard to matters which are essential to unity. To all intents and purposes the scheme creates an Ireland which is independent in all but the name. This is shown by the provision that Irish members and Irish representative peers shall not sit in the Imperial Parliament. If all else in the measure were good, that provision must be fatal to it. Mr. Gladstone was asked for Home Rule, and he proposes to give repeal. That is a gift which it is safe to say the country will not sanction."

The *Glasgow Herald* wrote: "The last refuge of admirers of Mr. Gladstone who have long lived on faith in him is at last gone. We can imagine the dismay with which his words will be read this morning. It is such a little while ago since he thundered over the whole Empire words which implied that whoever fell away from the idea of Imperial unity, and whosoever tried to shake it by conceding legislative independence to Ireland, he would not be the man; and now he has become practically the mouthpiece of the Nationalist party. The fall has been deplorable, for it has aroused hopes and excited fears that may lead to years of contest, and possibly to civil strife. The scheme is doomed. It can never be seriously entertained by any great body of thinking men in this country."

The weekly reviews, even those which, like the *Spectator*, had supported Mr. Gladstone on personal as well as political grounds, were almost unanimous in their hostility to his Irish policy.

The *Spectator* wrote: "There is one point in Mr. Gladstone's plan upon which, we trust, the British people will make no mistake. If this Bill passes, the Irish people will govern themselves as completely as if they were foreigners, will go their own way, whatever that way is, and will commence a new civilisation or establish anarchy, without control from any other authority than themselves. Mr. Gladstone's guarantees are pure illusions. The resignation of an Irish Ministry, supported by a majority, would make all Executive acts impossible, and reduce the government of the island to chaos. No official would be bound to obey an order not countersigned by a Secretary of State. The Bills which an Irish Premier proposes and an Irish Legislature accepts must become law, even if the first of them is the substitution of the Code Napoleon for the English Statute-book as the ground-law of the country. There is no veto left to the British Parliament—which, indeed, ceases to be the Imperial Parliament, for, by a provision absent from every colonial Constitution and unknown in our history, that Parliament surrenders even *its full right to repeal or amend 'the Magna Charta of Ireland.'*"

It can practically alter it only on the petition of the Irish Legislature."

The *Economist* said: "It is a scheme which makes directly towards disintegration, which will only strengthen and embitter the antagonism that exists; and which would hand that unhappy country over to the strife of rival factions, the bitter play of religious animosities, and the keener conflict of class hatreds. Ireland will always be striving to rid herself of the contribution she makes to the Imperial Exchequer, while Great Britain will not be disposed to have permanently laid upon it the burden of protecting Ireland at the cost of a war, to the expense of which the Irish people will contribute nothing. The independent Parliament thus leads directly to separation, and it leads as inevitably to bitter conflict in Ireland itself. No more chimerical project than this divided Parliament was ever devised. It would gather round it all the class and religious hatred that lie at the root of Ireland's unsettlement and discontent. It would be powerless for good and potent for evil, and in the interest of Ireland and Imperial unity alike the attempt to constitute it is to be condemned and opposed."

Dealing in another article with the financial aspect of Mr. Gladstone's proposal, the *Economist* maintained that they erred on the side of generosity: "He asks far less than he is entitled to, and gives far more than Ireland has any claim to receive. But even his liberally conceived scheme of finance brings out a very doubtful balance. If Mr. Gladstone's scheme were adopted the people of Ireland would before long be declaring that the 3½ millions of Imperial charges they were called upon to meet were far in excess of what they could pay, and that in fact it was absurd that they should be asked to pay anything."

The *Statist*, regarded as Mr. Giffen's organ, having balanced the arguments for and against a continued representation of Ireland at Westminster, decided that it would be much better to retain Irish members in the Imperial Parliament. The list of matters reserved to the Imperial Parliament was sufficiently long and sufficiently numerous to ensure that the Imperial unity would not be infringed. "English susceptibilities have been so much aroused that it would probably be impossible to carry the Bill were it proposed to hand over the police immediately to the new Irish Government. On the other hand, we fail to see how a Government is to make its authority respected if it has no armed force to execute its orders. Mr. Gladstone suggests that the arrangement is not to be permanent. We hope that its duration will be as short as possible; but, as Mr. Parnell sees his way to the acceptance of this portion of the Bill, it affords clear evidence that he does not contemplate a policy likely to alarm any portion of the population."

The *Saturday Review*, as might have been expected, was more bitter than most of its contemporaries, and could find no saving grace in any of the clauses of the Bill. "The great secret is out

at last, and a truly portentous secret it proves to be ; not less portentous in its governing principle, and even more so in some of its details, than the darkest anticipations had presaged. It is an effort unique in its kind ; it is the very senility of Siéyèsism constitution-mongering in its dotage. It would probably be difficult to get fifty members of Parliament beside the Parnellites to declare that, on their honour and conscience, and putting Mr Gladstone's wishes and interests out of the question, they think it a good thing for England or for Ireland to grant the latter an independence incompatible with any guarantees, and at the same time to impose guarantees incompatible with any independence.'

The organs of the English Roman Catholics were strongly opposed to a measure which it might have been thought would assure supremacy to their coreligionists in Ireland, and which the Ulster Protestants declared handed them and their religious liberty over to the Catholic majority.

"It is a bold Bill, and a Bill that spells secession," wrote the *Tablet*. "It was a strange sight surely, that of this old man pleading before a House, close ranked and pale with passion, that all the beliefs of his life were wrong, and calling upon the nation to divide its strength at its core. There is one provision in Mr. Gladstone's scheme which dwarfs all the others into littleness. We need think of nothing else, and ask about nothing else, now that we know that the Government proposals include not only the establishment of a statutory Parliament in Dublin, but the banishment of the Irish members from Westminster. The thing we have insisted on from the first, as the one thing needful, is the essential supremacy of a single Parliament, and that supremacy Mr. Gladstone cuts away. The abandonment of the common Parliament for the three peoples is a needless and mischievous concession to that craving after national and visible separateness which makes half the peril of our difficulty with Ireland. Trained as the English and Irish democracies have been trained they will inevitably see in the separate Parliaments the symbols of separate peoples. Unless Mr. Gladstone's Bill is mended upon this point it will be the clear duty of the English Commons to cast it out."

In a similar tone the *Weekly Register* wrote: "Rather than see the Catholic Church endowed by a Catholic people under the rule of Queen Victoria, Mr. Gladstone proposes to perpetuate one of the very worst of the anomalies between the three kingdoms. Mr. Gladstone, in a spirit of paradox, will deny to a self-governing Ireland that right to endow the Church of the majority which he admits England and Scotland ought to have. Surely not even English Conservatives will demand from him this denial of one of the first principles of his and their political life. If they do, there are Catholic voters in every English constituency, who have hitherto abstained from joining any agitation against the Establishment, but who will henceforth apply to English affairs the



principle which denies to Ireland the right of a union between Church and State."

In Parliament the immediate effect of the Bill was to outward view less striking than might have been expected. The Earl of Morley, one of Mr. Gladstone's favourite protégés, threw up the Chief Commissionership of Works, and was succeeded by the Earl of Elgin, and Mr. Heneage resigned the Chancellorship of the Duchy of Lancaster, whilst Mr. Jesse Collings, in consequence of his being unseated for Ipswich for the unauthorised action of an agent, was able to withdraw from the Local Government Board without the need of displaying his divergence from his colleagues. In consequence of these retirements Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth was advanced to the Chancellorship of the Duchy, and Mr. Stafford Howard and Mr. Borlase were taken into the Administration, all belonging to the Radical section of the Liberal party. Various peers, officers of the Household, either tendered their resignations or expressed the desire to do so if successors could be found and the necessities of State ceremonial complied with. Difficulties, however, arose in finding substitutes, and it was arranged that the actual holders of the different offices should continue to retain their places pending the decision of the House of Commons with regard to the Bill.

The introduction of the Government of Ireland Bill was followed (April 14) by a remarkable meeting at Her Majesty's Theatre, at which the attitude of the "Unionist Liberals" (as they were now beginning to be called) towards the Bill was more clearly defined. The object of the meeting was to protest against the Home Rule Bill. It matters little with which party the idea first originated, but from the outset it was arranged that the Conservative speakers should efface themselves behind their new allies. The chair was taken by Earl Cowper, who had been Mr. Gladstone's Viceroy of Ireland, with Mr. W. E. Forster as his Chief Secretary, and the platform was occupied by Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, Lord Fife, and Mr. P. Rylands on the one side, by Lord Salisbury, Mr. W. H. Smith, and Mr. Plunket on the other. The majority of those who filled the Opera House to the roof probably professed Conservative opinions, but no attempt had been made to exclude those of opposite views, although subsequently efforts were made to represent the meeting as a Tory gathering convened for the purpose of obstructing the Government. The more important utterances in any case were those of the Liberal speakers. Earl Cowper, in opening the proceedings, declared that he had not in the least abandoned his Liberal principles, but he felt that the country was face to face with an impending calamity, and that it was only right that men of all parties should meet to discuss a scheme which, in his opinion, was fraught with evil to Great Britain, and if carried would be utterly disastrous to Ireland. His experience there had taught him to believe that for its own sake Home Rule was really not desired

by anybody in Ireland. By many it was desired as a step towards separation, by many more it was desired as a step towards avoiding the payment of rent. Besides those there were the priests, who, since he was in Ireland, had been won over almost exclusively to the movement, but he believed they were actuated by a wish to secure the supremacy of their religion. They wished, many of them at all events, to establish an intolerant hierarchy which would gradually squeeze every religion but their own out of the country. With regard to the apparently overwhelming majority of Irishmen who had been returned to Parliament to support a Home Rule policy, nobody had any doubt that at the late election the power would be in the hands of what was in his time the Land League, but what was now the National League. Every meeting of the Land League when he was in Ireland was followed by an increase of crime. "Crime dogged the footsteps of the Land League. That expression was not his; it was the expression of the powerful, the too powerful minister who was now prepared to hand over the government. . . ." The end of his sentence was drowned in the applause by which this sentiment was greeted. Lord Hartington then moved the first resolution, which was to the effect that any proposals tending to invalidate the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland would prove disastrous to the interests of both countries. He said he might appeal to his former political conduct as a proof that he had not been in the habit lightly or without cause of separating himself from his party connection. Few men had adhered, however humbly and however inefficiently, more closely to their party, and few had more fully recognised than he had the imperative necessity in political life of subordinating personal opinions upon minor political questions, and the absolute necessity of maintaining the unity of the party for the purpose of carrying into effect the great objects upon which the party was generally agreed. Lord Hartington then went on to defend Mr. Gladstone against the evidently hostile feeling of the meeting, and declared that, although he felt bound to differ from him on the point under discussion, yet he believed him to be actuated by feelings as noble and as honest as any that ever inspired the conduct of an English statesman. If he (Lord Hartington) wanted a justification for his appearance on that platform, he said that he should find it in Mr. Gladstone's declaration of the previous night when he told the House of Commons that this subject now holds the field, and will continue to hold the field, to the exclusion of every other. "If this be so," he continued, "if we are to put aside from our minds the consideration of every other subject until this Irish difficulty is solved, what is to be the course of conduct of those who, like myself, hold strong opinions in opposition to the course now being taken? Are we to stand aside? Are we to be neutral? Are we to have no opinion, or to express no opinion of our own, while a policy is being proposed, and a Bill is being passed through

liament, to which we cannot give our assent? No, gentlemen, it be true—and I think it is true—that this question now holds the field to the exclusion of all others, we are bound to take our part, and to act with those, whoever they may be, with whose opinions on this greatest and most vital question we find ourselves most closely in accord to-day, and to take our own line and to pursue our own policy when this great and pressing emergency is at hand.

Lord Hartington then went on to say that he objected to the measure because it had not been submitted to, and had not received the sanction of, the country. This Parliament was not morally, it was constitutionally, competent to decide upon so vast an issue, which would change so fundamentally the relations which had hitherto subsisted between the two islands, and which would also change so fundamentally the powers of that Imperial Parliament and of that Government responsible to the Imperial Parliament which had hitherto existed as supreme authority in this kingdom. ‘I wish,’ continued Lord Hartington, ‘I could shut my eyes and ears to the opinions of almost all those in that part of Ireland which has hitherto been the most prosperous and the most contented, as to the consequences of this measure. I wish that I could forget the tendency of the teaching of the leaders of national opinion in Ireland, of the leaders who are shortly to become the rulers of Ireland. I wish I could find in their teaching any indication that they hold to those principles which form the foundation of civilised government; I wish I could see in their teaching any trace of respect for law, for the rights of property, and for the right of others to labour and enjoy the fruits of their industry. But I have failed to discover in the teaching of those men any such indication, and I am not so sanguine as to believe that by the adoption of the magic formula—self-government—all this teaching is to be reversed, and all those principles are to be reversed, that we find in those who have hitherto been the upholders and supporters of disorder, and that they will in future press upon their fellow-countrymen the imperative duty of respect for law and the rights of others.’

Mr. Rylands said he had been asked to second the resolution because he belonged to the advanced wing of the Liberal party. He was still loyal to that party, but, in face of the alarming proposal to change the Constitution, he, as a Radical, was ready to join hands with any party, whether Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen, who were determined, if necessary, by the sacrifice of any personal predilection or party ties to do all in their power to save the country from the disaster with which it was threatened. Many members of the House of Commons belonging to the Liberal party who disliked this measure were justifying their intended vote for it by saying that it was necessary to get rid of Ireland. If he thought that this measure would tend to develop the prosperity and welfare of our Irish

brethren, he would support it with all his heart. But misery and want were the roots from which grew the disaffection of the Irish people, and by driving capital out of the country the misery and distress of the people would only be increased. They were not told that the difficulty was to be removed by Irish members being sent to Westminster, but if that were the case they would have all the difficulties of Irish representation in the British Parliament but they would not give their money all the same. It was intolerable to suppose that the United Kingdom could any longer exist when taxation for its defence was to be taken off the shoulder of Ireland. He sincerely hoped that this delusive scheme, this degrading capitulation, these terms of dishonour, would be condemned by the entire voice of the people of this country.

The resolution having been carried by acclamation, Lord Salisbury then moved that a petition embodying its sense should be presented to both Houses of Parliament. He said that statesmen who had always maintained the integrity of the Empire suddenly, in obedience to some great delusion or fanatical interpretation of the obligations of party, had in a few weeks wheeled suddenly round, and, in the words of the ancient king, had determined "to burn that which they adored, and to adore that which they burnt." Home Rule, which a year ago was a chimerical dream, had suddenly become a burning question. In presence of so great a calamity threatening our nation, they should put aside all minor differences and join hands to defend that which is equally precious to all. If eloquence so great, experience so consummate, and influence so large as the Premier's could not produce a reasonable or tolerable measure of Home Rule, it was to be concluded that such a measure could not be produced at all. The problem was, he contended, absolutely insoluble. It was impossible to give fiscal freedom to the Parliament of Ireland and to preserve fiscal unity for the British Empire. "There is no middle term between government at Westminster and independent and entirely separate government at Dublin. Federation, of course, is conceivable. We know that it exists in Austria, Germany, and America. But we know also that the conditions which are necessary for it are wanting in this country. It is not within our political horizon. . . . My belief is that the future government of Ireland does not involve any unmanageable difficulty, for the people of this country will be true to the empire to which they belong. We want a wise, firm, continuous administration of the law. But you must support it, or it will not take place. We want a steady policy—that no considerations of weariness or difficulty at Westminster, that no considerations attaching to the manifold ties of party government under which we live, shall drive aside from its strong course the policy upon which the people of England have decided."

Lord Salisbury was followed by Mr. Goschen, who in an *impressive speech*, animated with unusual fire, declared that those

present in that building wished to express resolute resistance to a Bill damaging not only to Ireland itself, not only to Great Britain, but to the whole empire. Moreover, it contained the elements of injustice to many classes; and yet it was upon the ground of justice to Ireland that they were asked to pass it. But when did it dawn on people that justice demanded Home Rule? Expediency might change from time to time—majority might change from time to time—pressure might be put on at various times, but justice always remained in the same position. “Justice has often been described as wearing a bandage over her eyes. But I did not know that her worshippers were to remain blindfold till the bandage was torn off under the pressure of expediency and fear. And if justice is to be invoked, let it be invoked all round. Let it be invoked on behalf of those who have relied on us, who have stood by us, as well as on behalf of those who have been the opponents of order and of law and of imperial rule. Are we to attempt to square our obligations of honour to a deserted class by the reckless risk of public money? That would seem to me to be the last resort of baffled statesmanship.” Mr. Goschen proceeded to ask what would be the task before the new Executive. “They have taken a side—and what a side!—in the important struggle that has been raging in Ireland, and difficult, indeed, will be their task when, with the moderating influence of England removed, they have to deal with all those difficulties of race and creed and class which have convulsed the whole of Irish society. We have to bear in mind that it is not only Home Rule that has agitated Irish feeling, but difficulties of race and creed as great as have ever afflicted any people in Europe or elsewhere, and surely it does not imply any deep distrust if, in such a situation, we say it is Utopian to believe that the men who would be called upon to deal with it could be trusted in such a situation. The British democracy are as capable as any other class of entertaining strong feelings in support of imperial unity. But those who have the ear of the democracy must not be allowed to preach the gospel that surrender means justice and that capitulation is generosity.”

On the same day the election at Ipswich, where the sitting members (Liberals) had been unseated on petition, revealed the unpopularity of the Government scheme even in a working-class constituency in the provinces. The Solicitor-General (Sir Horace Davey), who had lost his seat at Christchurch at the general election, came forward on the present occasion for Ipswich in conjunction with Lord J. Hervey, a popular local Liberal, and both as supporters of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy. They were, however, defeated by two Scotch Conservatives, Lord Elcho and Mr. Dalrymple, by a slight majority—due rather to Liberal abstentions than to any accession of Conservative votes. This defeat was but partially retrieved by the acceptance of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre as the Liberal candidate for Mr. Forster's



vacant seat at Bradford, where ultimately (April 21), as a supporter of Mr. Gladstone, he defeated his Conservative opponent Mr. E. B. Hoare, by 760 votes—about half Mr. Forster's majority over his Conservative opponent at the general election of the previous autumn.

Amid the din of hostile criticism evoked on all sides by the Government proposals, the support of a statesman so experienced and so consistent as Earl Granville should not be overlooked. Speaking at the National Liberal Club (April 14), immediately after the first reading of the Ministerial measures, he said that although for years he had been in favour of self-government for Ireland, he had only lately arrived at the conviction that less than what was now proposed would be a great error. Mr. Chamberlain had alluded to the apparent inconsistency of some who had objected last year to the plan of a General Council at Dublin, and now supported a wider measure. When that scheme was proposed Lord Granville and some of his then colleagues said that of the two they would prefer a larger measure. His objections to that proposal were, that such a council would be dissatisfied and would strive to become, and after much friction succeed in becoming, a Parliament, while, on the other hand there would remain in the House of Commons a large number of Home Rulers, representing dissatisfied constituencies, believing themselves justified in obstructing legislation, and disposing of the fate of successive Governments, and able to do so. His wish at the time was to give large powers of self-government according to a plan of Lord John Russell's to the four Irish provinces. But the more he had thought of the matter the more convinced he had become that, in order to do anything to be permanently successful, the plan must be sufficiently comprehensive to recommend itself to the great majority of the Irish people.

We now pass on to describe the other half of Mr. Gladstone's great scheme for the pacification and reconciliation of Ireland—the settlement of the land question, which was to be the necessary complement of the Home Rule Bill. Before reaching Mr. Gladstone's proposals, however, it is almost necessary to refer briefly to the arguments put forward in support of further legislation on the Irish land question. It was urged by many that the difficulties it presented had been finally, if not satisfactorily, met by the Land Bill of 1881 and its subsequent extensions. But few who read the letters and articles with which the public press teemed could resist the conviction that a settlement was still remote, that the Land League was persistently increasing in power and widening the area of its influence. It was, moreover, no longer possible to doubt that the League owed its strength to the agrarian difficulty, and that, in proportion as agricultural distress extended, its suggestions were accepted by farmers and tenants. It had been urged that Irish *disaffection* would disappear so soon as tenants knew that it was

within their own power to become absolute owners of the soil they tilled; and to meet this feeling loans were authorised to be made from public funds, increasing in proportion until at length the would-be purchaser was enabled to borrow the full sum to be paid for his holding. Nevertheless, in spite of successive relaxations of the original Land Bill, Irish disaffection was but little abated, and difficulties between tenants and landlords were marked by the usual recurrence of cruelty and brutality. There seemed, moreover, fair ground for supposing that in certain districts "judicial rents" as fixed by the Land Commissioners could not be maintained in face of the bad harvests and reduced prices. On the other hand, the position of the Irish landlords, who, accepting the legislation of 1881, had agreed to reduce their rents on the understanding that they would be paid, was becoming critical. If they appealed to the law to assist them their appeal was the signal for disturbance in the district; yet without the pressure of the law they were unable, they asserted, to obtain the rent due to them. Out of this deadlock there arose the proposal that the State should intervene between the landlords and the tenants, and, purchasing the soil from the former at certain fixed rates, should receive from the tenant interest in lieu of rent until such time as he should acquire absolute possession of his tenancy. Against this proposal the political economists loudly protested, and Sir James Caird, as their spokesman, declared that the purchase of land at that moment would prove a bad investment; and still more strongly that in the enormous majority of Irish tenancies the land proposed to be purchased was almost, if not quite, worthless. In a letter addressed to the *Times* (March 20) Sir James Caird said: "We are only beginning to realise the cause and effect of the collapse of prices of agricultural produce. The loss of spendable income, as compared with ten years ago, is reported, on working the figures out, at an annual loss by landlords of 20,000,000*l.*, by tenants of 20,000,000*l.*, and by labourers of 2,800,000*l.* It is only the land of higher quality in this country, the better class of arable land and the good grass land, that are at present yielding any satisfactory returns. A large proportion of the land of Ireland, under the new circumstances in which we are placed, must very soon go out of cultivation. The land in Ireland is held by two distinct classes of tenants—the small farmers who pay rent from 1*l.* to 20*l.*, and the comparatively large farmers who pay rent from 20*l.* upwards. Of the first class there are 588,000 holdings, averaging 6*l.* each, of the second class 121,000 holdings, averaging 56*l.* each. The rent payable by the first class is 3,572,000*l.*, and by the second class 6,845,000*l.* Five-sixths of the Irish tenants thus pay about one-third of the total rental, and one-sixth pay nearly two-thirds. If the present prices of agricultural produce continue, I should fear that from the land held by the large body of poor farmers in Ireland any

economical rent has for the present disappeared. A purchase of it at any price would, therefore, be certain loss. How many years' purchase, even with better prospects, would any sane capitalist give for a nominal rental of three and a half millions, to be collected from 500,000 holdings of poor land, from tenants averaging 6*l.* each? If a purchase of the poor land must result in certain loss, there is on the other hand no need to buy the good land. The strong farmer sent us over in 1882 cattle and sheep valued at 16,500,000*l.* They are the chief depositors in the Irish banks, and they and their landlords are quite able to take care of themselves. But a purchase even of the good land could not be made at present without great risk of loss. There can be no adequate security at present given by the land of Ireland for such a stupendous advance by the British people. And I trust that the wisdom of Parliament may guard the country from being committed to an engagement which could only end in loss and, possibly, disaster."

A few days later (March 29) he wrote to say that from an unguarded expression in his former letter inferences had been drawn of much wider effect than he intended to convey. In order, therefore, to place the discussion on a firm basis he gave in tabular form the various classes of agricultural holdings in Ireland:—

1.	218,000	holdings averaging	£2	each equal to	£436,000
2.	196,000	"	7	"	1,372,000
3.	78,000	"	12	"	936,000
4.	46,000	"	18	"	828,000
5.	47,000	"	25	"	1,175,000
6.	24,000	"	35	"	840,000
7.	14,000	"	45	"	630,000
8.	24,000	"	75	"	1,800,000
9.	12,000	"	200	"	2,400,000

---

659,000 holdings, equalling a total rent of £10,417,000

---

In very many cases several holdings were held by the same tenants. "I am now," continued Sir J. Caird, "told by competent authority that the probabilities are that there are now only about 400,000 *bonâ fide* agriculturists in Ireland. Numbers 1 and 2 of the above table represented about two-thirds of the holdings of 1881, and it was these small holders I had chiefly in view when I spoke of the 'poor, worn-out, badly farmed land in Ireland,' a large portion of which must soon go out of cultivation. But I deeply regret to find, what I did not observe at the moment of writing, that the words I used admitted of a much wider significance. I have letters from various Irish landlords who have no desire to part with their estates or to quit the country. No man, it is said, who has a real stake in it desires a purchase scheme. The Act of 1885 extended the facilities for purchase so largely that any Irish tenant who can agree with his landlord as to the price, and if that price does not exceed twenty years' pur-

chase of his present rent, can now put himself into possession of his farm, and gradually be growing into a landowner, by continuing to pay, not his present rent, but one-fifth less, for forty-nine years, at the end of which the land will be his own. Never in any country has an offer by a Government of a character more generous towards tenant-farmers been made than this. Its operation would be gradual. There would be no sudden disintegration of society. Most of the landlords and Protestant clergy would remain and continue that moderating influence which education and example provide. There is no need of any heroic remedy, no occasion for the risk of a vast addition to the National Debt. We have simply to act on the law as it at present stands, enlarging its scope from time to time as occasion demands and as other public interests of the country admit."

Upon the facts and figures given by Sir J. Caird the controversy on the agricultural condition of Ireland and the remedies to be applied raged for many weeks. On the one side were those who thought that by a judicious apportionment of bribes and sops to landlords and tenants a settlement might be arrived at; whilst at the other extreme were those who saw no remedy for existing ills in anything short of compulsory expropriation. Among the numerous schemes put forward by amateur politicians and economists, that by Lord Monteagle, an Irish landlord, and at the same time a thorough Liberal, attracted considerable attention. He proposed to divide the agricultural tenants into three classes—(A) estates not within two miles of a town over 3,000 inhabitants, on which three-quarters of the tenants are under 10*l.* valuation—these are the "cottier" estates; (B) tenants outside A, and not exceeding 50*l.* valuation; (C) tenants over 50*l.* valuation. He estimated the numbers and rental of the three classes roughly as follows:—

	No. Families.	Rental.
Class A . . . .	148,000	£1,000,000
" B . . . .	475,000	6,500,000
" C . . . .	37,000	1,500,000
Totals . . . .	660,000	9,000,000

The treatment of these was:—

Class A.—Buy out landlord at (say) twenty years' purchase of net judicial rent, after deducting landlord's proportion of poor rate (which will on all holdings not exceeding 4*l.* valuation be the whole). This would require about 18,000,000*l.*, and might be payable in Consols at par.

Make State tenants liable to a rent charge of 4 per cent. on purchase money, reducible to 3½ if paid within one month of sale day, with the following privileges:—

1. Right of free sale to any one person.
2. Right to fine down and extinguish rent charge by payment of 25*s.* for 1*s.* rent: *this to be facilitated by a rent bank.*

3. Right to receive from the State (say) five years' purchase of rent if evicted. N.B.—Subdivision prohibited.

The State to set apart annually for (say) twenty years one quarter of rent charge received for the following purposes:—

1. Technical education within the district—for example fishery schools.

2. Development of district by tramways, harbours, &c., with a view also to giving employment. (A comprehensive railway scheme, with Government control, was the scheme for relieving economic pressure favoured by Thomas Drummond, the Irish Under-Secretary in 1835-39, but it was defeated by Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington.)

3. Compensation for Eviction.—This fund to be administered by a Commission on which some advanced Nationalist, such as Mr. Davitt, should have a seat.

Class B.—The dual ownership being admittedly cumbrous and unsatisfactory, some means should be taken to expedite enfranchisement. The analogy of the copyright might, he thought, be followed with advantage, either landlord or tenant having power to compel the other to buy (or sell). If sliding scales of prices could be arranged, as in case of tithes, and judicial rents commuted into a perpetual charge, varying with prices, the enfranchisement might be much facilitated.

Class C might quite well be left to voluntary arrangements, especially as most of them would be now outside the Act of 1881.

By this and many other proposals, the public mind had become accustomed to the idea that, under some form or another, the State—by which was understood the Imperial Exchequer—was expected to apply the healing balm to the woes of Irish landlords and tenants. Mr. Gladstone, in truth, had an embarrassing supply of suggestions from friends and foes on this matter; and it was therefore strange that his own proposal did not find favour among some independent groups. But the result showed that whilst it was either imperfectly understood, and variously interpreted by his own immediate supporters, it was generally repudiated by those outside that circle. One might almost have gathered, from the hesitancy with which he consented to expound its terms before the House rose for the Easter recess, that he had doubts in his own mind as to the prudence of the step which, after much pressure from the Opposition leaders, he was taking. He probably imagined that the criticisms which might be brought against the Government of Ireland Bill at public meetings would lose much of their force so long as the Land Bill remained unfolded. If, however, Mr. Gladstone at any moment contemplated this *finesse*, he was unable to put it into execution, and, on the night after Sir W. Harcourt had brought forward his colourless Budget, Mr. Gladstone rose to redeem his pledge (April 16) of supplementing the Government of Ireland Bill by a Land Purchase Bill. He began by saying that he was,



in fact, only concluding the speech with which he had introduced the other portion of the Government scheme, which was at present incomplete. He claimed for this second measure the special privilege that, whilst the landlords and their interests were its primary object, it would confer great benefits, not only on the tenants, but on the people of Ireland as distinct from the tenants. He was going to ask the House to make a great effort on behalf of the landlords of Ireland, whom he knew to be most generally hostile to the policy of the Government. He fully admitted that such a proposal would be jealously received by many of those most friendly to the Irish policy of the Government; and in adopting this attitude towards the Land Purchase scheme, such members were only fulfilling their duty towards their constituents. "The end and aim, however, of all our endeavours is not in the first place, and for its own sake simply, the contentment of the people in Ireland, but it is the social order of the country." To the question which many a member, Liberal as well as Conservative, must have put to himself, "Must the Land Question be dealt with?" Mr. Gladstone replied that it could only be answered by a careful study of the whole history of Ireland. That study revealed, he pursued, a serious indictment against Irish landlords. They had been the heirs of a sad inheritance; and of this, down to the time of the Irish Parliament, and during its continuance, there was abundant evidence. The oppression of Irish peasants by absentee landlords had been one of the saddest and most permanent notes in the history of the country. The Irish Parliament, composed of pensioners, placemen, and landlords, made no effort to do justice to the peasantry. "When oppression is married to misery," Mr. Gladstone continued, "there springs from the union a fatal and a hideous progeny of crime; and that crime is endowed with a vitality to perpetuate itself, and hands on the baleful and miserable inheritance from generation to generation. That is the case of absenteeism in Ireland; that is the case of the rooted tendency to crime, which springs from causes most disgraceful to those who were charged with the government of Ireland and the care of its population; most disgraceful to them, and most perplexing and embarrassing to us. The differences of religion down to the year 1829 were the basis of an odious political system, and traces of them unfortunately survived that period. The one point of union that there was between the Irish landlord and his tenant, that sentiment of nationality which the old Irish Parliament never lost, has since the Union greatly ceased to have a mitigating and beneficial influence on Irish life."

Mr. Gladstone then went on to explain his reasons for introducing a Land Bill. He maintained that after the long continuance of the mischief it would be an ill-intended and an ill-shapen kindness to any class in Ireland to hand over to an Irish Legislature, as its first introduction to its work, the business of dealing

with the land question. It would be like giving over to Ireland the worst part of her feuds, and to confront her with the necessity for efforts which would possibly be hopeless, but which, at any rate, would be attended with the most fearful risks. In reply to the inquiry why Great Britain was to be cumbered with an endeavour to settle this question, Mr. Gladstone argued that the obligation on our part had been admitted already in a partial form by the Land Purchase Acts. But these Acts would present an extremely bad and dangerous form of dealing with this obligation, for their basis was to place the British Treasury in contact with the individual occupier and farmer. After showing the dangers incident on the extension of such a position, especially when the two States should come to have a separate existence, Mr. Gladstone continued: "We have struggled to introduce into the Irish Government Bill what are called safeguards for the minority, without, I admit, obtaining the smallest mitigation from our adversaries of their opposition. Acting on the same principle, and if I may allow myself to use hallowed words in no jesting spirit, 'walking by faith and not by sight,' so we desire by exhibiting the utmost consideration for the imperilled class, or at any rate for the class impressed deeply with fear and apprehension, the Irish landlords, we are disposed to do everything on their behalf which duty will allow us to do. . . . We cannot wash ourselves clean and clear of the responsibility. The deeds of the Irish landlords are to a great extent our deeds. . . . The landlords were our garrison in Ireland. We planted them there, and we replanted them in 1641, in 1688; and again in 1798 we reconquered the country from them. We used the whole civil government of Ireland as an engine of wholesale corruption, and we extended that corruption to what ought to have been a sacred thing—namely, the Church which we maintained and supported in the land. As to the Union, it is dreadful to read the language of Lord Cornwallis and the disgust of an honourable mind at the transactions in which he found himself under the painful necessity of engaging. That Union was obtained against the sense of every class of the community by wholesale bribery and unblushing intimidation." Under the British Parliament the tenants' protections were swept away in 1816. The attempt even failed to carry out the recommendations of the Devon Commission in 1843, which spoke of the hardships of the Irish labourer. The Encumbered Estates Bill was produced with a general lazy and uninformed good intention of taking capital to Ireland. But in reality the improvements of the tenants were sold. "The tenant lost his old landlord, who was in many cases an easy-going personage, and had oftentimes established a *modus vivendi* with his tenant, who was handed over to a horde of new proprietors, who were told that they might exact greater rent from the tenant, and who took in the form of rent that which *was the produce of the tenant's labour.*"

Mr. Gladstone then went on to explain the leading features of the Land Purchase Bill, which would come into operation on the same day as the Home Rule Bill. Under it the Statutory Parliament (or by whatever the legislative body established in Dublin came to be known) would be empowered to appoint any person or body, to be called "the State authority," to be the medium of purchase under the Act by means of a new three per cent. stock, issued at par on the application of the Land Commissioners. The object of the Act, said Mr. Gladstone, was to give to all Irish landowners the option of being bought out on the terms of the Act; to give all Irish landowners an opening towards the exercise of that option where their rent was from agricultural land. It however did not pretend to deal with mansions, demesnes, and woods. He continued: "The State authority as I have described it—that is, an organ representing the Irish legislative bodies—is to be the middle term between the vendor and the occupier. It is through that medium that the transaction is to take place. And lastly, as a general rule, what we propose is that upon the sale the peasant is to become the proprietor. He is not to be, in our view, as a general rule, an occupier subject to rent-charge, or subject to be dealt with by any one as such, until the expiration of a certain term, when he is to become the proprietor; but he is to become the proprietor at once, except that he is to be subject to a burden hereafter to be described. The State authority is to be the purchaser, and the occupier is to become the proprietor. There are exceptions. It might not be well in all cases to force the very smallest occupiers to become proprietors if for any particular reasons it did not suit their condition. At any rate, the tenant at 4*l.* and under is not to be compelled to become a proprietor unless he wishes it. There is another more important exception. In the congested districts we propose that the State authority should be not merely the vehicle through which the purchase is to be effected and carried on to the tenant, but the State authority is also to be the proprietor. I am bound to say that we reserve for further consideration the question whether in these districts, and these only, there should be introduced the power of compulsory expropriation of landlords."

Mr. Gladstone then turned to the important point of the price to be fixed. The nominal purchase price he proposed to fix at twenty years' purchase of the net rental ascertained by deducting law charges, bad debts, and cost of management from the judicial rent. "Where there is no judicial rental, we are in greater difficulty, and we introduce a provision which enables the Land Court, if it shall see cause, to take a given district of Ireland—probably an electoral division—to take the judicial rents within that division, to take Griffith's valuation within that division, to see the relation between the judicial rents and Griffith's valuation, and to use that relation as a guide in determining

what shall be the standard rental which is to be the basis of the transaction. In exceptional cases there will be twenty-two years' purchase. In others the rate can be diminished."

To meet the demand for the means of purchase thus established, Mr. Gladstone proposed to create 50,000,000*l.* of three per cents., of which 10,000,000*l.* would be issued in 1887-88, and 20,000,000*l.* in each of the two succeeding financial years; but no application from a landlord would be received after March 31, 1890. Originally he had contemplated 113,000,000*l.* as the sum to be named in the Bill, but since the retirement of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Trevelyan the subject had been more fully considered by the Cabinet, and he confessed he now thought the smaller sum the more advisable, though he repeated that the policy of the Bill was to include all landlords. Mr. Gladstone, moreover, admitted that if the constructive promise made to the landlords was fully redeemed more money would be required. "I arrived at the deliberate conviction that it would have been a great error on our part to ask at this moment, now, at once, for a sum founded upon anything like an outside estimate of the possibilities of the case. I felt we ought to ask from Parliament what would secure an efficient progress of the measure, if it became really an operative measure, but that we ought to reserve to Parliament after we had reached that point an opportunity of exercising its discretion afresh. There are a multitude of other conditions and considerations affecting the future Irish authority, conditions affecting the Irish tenant, conditions affecting the money market, and the nature of those issues are not matters of good faith even for us, but are more or less, though by no means generally or universally, matters of good faith, matters of good policy and expediency. From my point of view, I conceive that it is quite right in an arrangement of this kind that we should secure to Parliament an opportunity of exercising its judgment afresh on the subject we now submit to it. So far as good faith is concerned, what I am quite certain of is this—that if Parliament accedes to and accepts this particular Bill, if it finds that the promises under which we commend the Bill are fulfilled, if it finds that public credit is duly maintained, if it finds that repayments are duly made, if it finds that the whole complex machinery is so well oiled that it works like a locomotive, and if the public credit is safe, as we are sure it will be, in my opinion Parliament will never under-estimate the moral obligations that may be comprehended in the subject."

Passing next to the manner in which the repayment of the advance would be secured, Mr. Gladstone announced that a Receiver-General under British authority would be appointed. Through his hands all rents and all Irish revenues whatsoever would pass, and the rent-charge would be the first charge thereon. The Receiver, however, would have no power to levy rents or

other revenues in Ireland. "It is necessary," said Mr. Gladstone, "for the Irish authority, if it is to govern Ireland, to have funds for the purpose. These funds shall be subject to the discharge of prior obligations, and the right of the Irish authority to the money shall begin at the point where the prior obligations end. For that purpose, except under the limited arrangement as to the Customs and certain Excise duties, we are not going to take the levying of the rents and revenues out of Irish hands. That is the very last thing I should desire to do; that of all others is the thing which would be most opposed to the purpose and the policy of the whole Act. But we are going to require that the money which has been levied for the service of Ireland shall all converge and run into a certain channel. We shall have the money, as it is sometimes said, between the body and the head, the head being the Irish Government. The money must all pass through the channel of the neck, and the neck is the Receiver-General."

Mr. Gladstone then went on to show that the Irish Revenue would have ample funds to meet the charge thrown upon it by the purchase of the land; but in so doing, he limited himself to the restricted scope of the Bill, under which only 50,000,000*l.* Consols were to be created, in respect of which the Imperial Exchequer was to receive 2,000,000*l.* a year for interest and sinking fund. This sum was to be secured on the land rents which the State authority would have at its disposal, and valued at 2,500,000*l.*; and Mr. Gladstone anticipated that the State authority would show the greatest vigilance in the collection of that rental, inasmuch as till this first charge on the Irish Revenue was paid the Irish Government could touch nothing. There was, moreover, a further security for the regular payment of the interest. "It will be a first charge on the taxes levied under the Irish State authority, which I have assumed will amount to 5,778,000*l.* You may say there is also the Imperial contribution to be taken into view, and the charge for the constabulary. If I add to them the 2,000,000*l.* which I have now spoken of in respect to land, the sum comes out thus. We want to get 6,242,000*l.*, and that is secured upon 10,859,000*l.*, no portion of which can be applied for any other purpose until our claim in respect of the 6,000,000*l.* is satisfied."

Mr. Gladstone then illustrated the working of his plan by a typical case, and showed that upon the land transaction there would be an average margin of 18 per cent. left for the State authority, which would act as the middle term between the vendor and the purchaser, whilst the latter on the sale being effected would immediately become proprietor of the land, subject to the annual charge of 4 per cent. on the net (not the gross) rental for 49 years. Mr. Gladstone concluded by saying: "I commend this measure with the utmost earnestness as a comple-



ment to our policy, adopted under serious convictions both of honour and of duty—I commend it to your strict, your jealous, your careful, and your unbiassed examination, convinced as I am that when that examination has been given to it, both in regard to policy and honour and duty, it will be recognised as a fitting part of our proceedings upon this certainly great and, as I believe, auspicious occasion; and as fitting to—I do not say adorn—but to accredit and sustain the plans of the British Legislature for the welfare of what is and what has long been, and what I hope will ever be, under happier circumstances than heretofore, an integral portion of her Majesty's dominions."

In the discussion which followed Mr. Chamberlain found an opportunity for completing the statement of his reasons for leaving the Cabinet, which had been interrupted by Mr. Gladstone on a previous occasion. There was a preliminary skirmish between the Prime Minister and the ex-President of the Local Government Board, the latter stating that the question which most clearly presented itself to his mind was whether he liked the proposed Irish scheme so much as to risk 120,000,000*l.* of the money of the British taxpayer to secure it. To this Mr. Gladstone demurred that there was no question of the sum named; but Mr. Chamberlain stuck to his version and declared that he had not the slightest conception that there was any intention to reduce the amount named. He then went on to read his letter of resignation which he had sent to Mr. Gladstone on March 15, which, making as it did the disruption of the Liberal party, had become a document of historical importance:—

"My dear Mr. Gladstone,—I have carefully considered the results of the discussion on Saturday, and I have come with the deepest reluctance to the conclusion that I shall not be justified in attending the meeting of the Cabinet on Tuesday, and that I must ask you to lay my resignation before her Majesty. You will remember that in accepting office I expressed grave doubts as to the probability of my being able to support your Irish policy. Up to that time, however, no definite proposals had been formulated by you, and it was only on Saturday last that you were in a position to make a communication to the Cabinet on the subject. Without entering on unnecessary details, I may say that you proposed a scheme of Irish land purchase which involved an enormous and unprecedented use of British credit in order, in your own words, 'to afford to the Irish landlord refuge and defence from a possible mode of government in Ireland which he regards as fatal to him.' This scheme, while contemplating only a trifling reduction of the judicial rents fixed before the recent fall in prices, would commit the British taxpayer to tremendous obligations, accompanied, in my opinion, with serious risk of ultimate loss. The greater part of the land of Ireland would be *handed over* to a new Irish elective authority, who would thus be

at once the landlords and the delegates of the Irish tenants. I fear that these two capacities would be found inconsistent, and that the tenants, unable or unwilling to pay the rents demanded, would speedily elect an authority pledged to give them relief and to seek to recoup itself by an early repudiation of what would be described as the English tribute. With these anticipations I was naturally anxious to know what was the object for which this risk was to be incurred and for what form of Irish government it was intended to pave the way. I gathered from your statements that, although your plans are not finally matured, yet that you have come to the conclusion that any extension of local government on municipal lines, including even the creation of a national council, or councils, for purely Irish business would now be entirely inadequate, and that you are convinced of the necessity for conceding a separate legislative assembly for Ireland with full powers to deal with all Irish affairs. I understood that you would exclude from their competence the control of the army and navy and the direction of foreign and colonial policy, but that you would allow them to arrange their own customs tariff, to have entire control of the civil forces of the country, and even, if they thought fit, to establish a volunteer army. It appears to me that a proposal of this kind must be regarded as tantamount to a proposal for separation. I think it is even worse, because it would set up an unstable and temporary form of government which would be a source of perpetual irritation and agitation until the full demands of the Nationalist party were conceded. The Irish Parliament would be called upon to pay three or four millions a year as its contribution to the National Debt and the army and navy, and it would be required in addition to pay nearly five millions a year for interest and sinking fund on the cost of Irish land. These charges would be felt to be so heavy a burden on a poor country that persistent controversy would arise thereupon, and the due fulfilment of their obligations by the new Irish authority could only be enforced by a military intervention, which would be undertaken with every disadvantage, and after all the resources of the country and the civil executive power had been surrendered to the Irish National Government. I conclude, therefore, that the policy which you propose to recommend to Parliament and the country practically amounts to a proposal that Great Britain should burden itself with an enormous addition to the National Debt and, probably, also to an immediate increase of taxation, not in order to secure the closer and more effective union of the three kingdoms, but, on the contrary, to purchase the repeal of the Union and the practical separation of Ireland from England and Scotland. My public utterances and my conscientious convictions are absolutely opposed to such a policy, and I feel that the differences which have now been disclosed are so vital that I can no longer entertain the hope of being of service in the Government. I m

therefore, respectfully request you to take the necessary steps for relieving me of the office I have the honour to hold.—I am,  
yours very truly,

“ J. CHAMBERLAIN.”

In the correspondence which ensued Mr. Gladstone said that although in some details it might be impossible to make modifications, yet he was not hopeful of doing so with regard to Chamberlain's main objections. Changes, it is true, were subsequently made, the nature of which he subsequently described, but finding himself at variance with the majority of his colleagues and not wishing to act as a spy upon them, he maintained his intention to resign, and, although Mr. Gladstone thought it premature, it was finally accepted on March 27.

Mr. Chamberlain then proceeded to refer to the changes made in the scheme. First the control of the Customs and Excise had been retained by the Imperial Parliament and taken from the control of the new legislative body to be established in Dublin. Thus, three-quarters of the existing imperial taxation of Ireland was to be retained by the Parliament at Westminster. There was the possibility of the retention of the Irish members in the Parliament at Westminster. That was a matter of cardinal importance, for the Imperial Parliament would then remain the Imperial Parliament, and its supremacy would be an established fact. The legislative authority in Dublin would be a subordinate and not a coequal authority, and if Ulster were left an option there might be two legislative authorities in Ireland instead of one. Then, except in the name, it would be very difficult to see very much difference between the proposal and that of national councils, or a single national council. “ If the authorities created are to be the subordinate local assemblies in Ireland, there is no need whatever for all these precautions for the peerages in the legislative assembly, for the *ex officio* members for the property qualifications, for the provision of minority representation, all of which I do not hesitate to say are hateful to every Radical, and certainly contrary to the practice of the Liberal party. In these changes and in the prospect of greater changes to come I rejoice to see an approximation between the views of my right hon. friend and myself, which I did not dare to hope for at the time I left the Cabinet. I confess that with regard to the Land Bill I am afraid that very serious differences of opinion will still exist. I objected to the original proposal because, in the first place, it involved such an enormous sum of money. I thought it might have been possible to deal with all events with the most urgent part of this question by employing to a very much less extent British credit. I objected because I thought that there was not sufficient security for the repayment of the money, and that the British taxpayer would probably have to make it good; and because I thought that the scheme originally introduced did not provide sufficient advantage for the tenant, with whom I had the greatest sympathy, and the

in fact, its central idea was wrong, inasmuch as it was brought in less for the advantage of the tenant of Ireland than to modify the supposed hostility of the Irish landlord. Well now, sir, to some extent these objections have been met. For instance, my right hon. friend now proposes that the Irish tenant should have an immediate advantage to the extent of 20 per cent. on his present rent. That is a good deal more than he was able to anticipate at the time when I was in the Government. That is a very important question, because the way in which his scheme will be received in Ireland must depend to a very large extent indeed upon the immediate boon it affords to the Irish tenant. Then my right hon. friend, in a way which, I confess, I was not clever enough to follow very clearly during his speech, proposes to limit the issue of Consols, that was to have been limited to 120,000,000*l.*, as I understand, to 50,000,000*l.* Well, my difficulty is this. I suppose the rented agricultural land of Ireland at twenty years' purchase is worth at least 150,000,000*l.* sterling. This option is to be offered to every landowner to the extent of 150,000,000*l.* Then why should not all avail themselves of it? In that case you may in the first year have a demand for 150,000,000*l.*, and if that is accepted, how are you to limit the issue of Consols? There is another point in which the changes made by my right hon. friend are much more satisfactory. My right hon. friend now proposes to retain the Customs and Excise with the Imperial Parliament. That makes a great difference in the security. The operation proposed by my right hon. friend in the original Bill will now be reversed, and, instead of Ireland paying a large sum to England, it will be England who will have to pay money back to Ireland, after having recouped herself for interest and sinking fund. Now, sir, these alterations have lessened to some extent, though I cannot say they have removed, my objections to this measure."

Mr. Chamberlain then went on to ask, if the commercial classes and Protestants of Ireland were safe in the hands of the new authority, why the landlords' interests needed special protection; and as this bargain came to the Irish people in a foreign garb, and as a foreign bargain, would they not think that they had an equitable right to repudiate; and, if so, how could its conditions be enforced against the will of the Irish people? The money, moreover, if forthcoming, was perhaps as much, if not more, needed in England, where State aid to the agricultural and artisan poor was as persistently denied as to the Scotch Crofters, all of whom were as deserving of it as the people of Ireland. But at the close of his speech Mr. Chamberlain expressed himself ready to recognise the spirit of conciliation with which the Government had tried to meet some of the objections taken to the scheme: "I need not assure my right hon. friend or my friends around me that though differences unfortunately for a time—though but for a short time—have separated me from my right hon. friend, they have not impaired *my respect* or regard for his character and

abilities. I am not an irreconcilable opponent. My right friend has made very considerable modifications. All I can say is, if that movement continues, as I hope it may, I shall be delighted to be relieved from an attitude which I only assume with the greatest reluctance, and which I can only maintain with the deepest pain and regret."

Among the speeches which followed, that only of Mr. Parnell was indicative of the attitude which the Nationalist member would assume, was interesting. While declining to pronounce an opinion on the Bill at present, he characterised the appointment of a Receiver-General as absurd and unnecessary and indicative of distrust. The Bill must be tested by its clauses for ascertaining the landlords' interest, and, while holding that the arrangement when made ought not to be repudiated, he thought this could not be expected if too hard terms were pressed on the tenants. He had no wish to treat this as a party question, and desired that there should be give and take between landlord and tenant; but he warned the landlords' friends that if they rejected this offer it would not be repeated.

The Bill was then brought in and read a first time without challenge.

If the reception of the Government of Ireland Bill had even in the Liberal press been lukewarm, that of the Land Purchase Bill was absolutely cold. The Irish Nationalist papers denounced it as a "transparent sham"; the London papers, with the single exception of the *Daily News*, declared that it would commit itself neither to politician nor financier. The *Scotsman* and the *Glasgow Herald* declared that Mr. Gladstone had not improved his position or the prospects of his legislation. On the other hand, the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Leeds Mercury*, and the *Newcastle Chronicle* regarded it as satisfactory, workmanlike, and desirable; whilst the *Birmingham Post* thought it capable of modifications and amendments.

The Land Purchase Bill, however, never passed beyond its initial stage; and as to the extent of the modifications to which Mr. Gladstone would have consented, no authoritative statement was made. Its most obvious outcome was a decided weakening of the Ministry. A reluctant assent to its principles was scarcely accorded by the Home Rulers; and in their attitude many half-hearted supporters of the Irish policy of the Government saw an intention to accept the present offers as merely an instalment of their full demands. The Radicals and the political economists protested against such a lavish expenditure of Imperial money or national credit; and even the landowners, Liberal and Conservative, declined to entertain the liberal terms offered accompanied, as they declared, by a surrender of the supremacy of Parliament.

The Irish policy of the Government was, however, not before the country, and in the interval which was to elapse before



a decision could be taken public interest was excited to the highest pitch, as much by the eager advocacy of one party and the destructive criticisms of the other, as by the manœuvres and intrigues by which it was hoped that the Liberals might be brought to show one united front to their Conservative assailants.

## CHAPTER IV.

**The Position of Parties—Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen—The Dissident Whigs and Mr. Gladstone—Earl Spencer's Speech at Newcastle-on-Tyne—Mr. John Morley's Re-election Opposed—Lord Hartington and his Constituents—Mr. Chamberlain at Birmingham—Mr. Gladstone's Letter to the Electors of Midlothian—Mr. Goschen's Campaign—The Second Reading of the Irish Government Bill - Protracted Debate—Defeat of the Government—Legislation of the Session—Prorogation and Dissolution of Parliament.**

FROM the moment when Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, by their speeches on the introduction of the Government Bills, showed how wide and deep was the breach between them and their former colleagues, public opinion busied itself unceasingly in forecasting the results of this schism. The defection of a few Liberals was inevitable, and, although their position in the party might be important, it was scarcely likely to prevail against party discipline and local influences. From the very first it was assumed that the Home Rule Bill, as it was called, had no chance of passing the House of Lords, a conviction which was deepened by the unfavourable reception given to the Land Purchase Bill. But it was by no means clear that its rejection by the Upper House had not been foreseen by Mr. Gladstone from the first, and that a dissolution, consequent upon a direct conflict between the two Houses, would not have suited his plans for obtaining a definite and final settlement of the Irish question. To effect the passing of at least one of the two Bills by the House of Commons became, therefore, the object of the keenest strategy. On the morrow of Mr. Gladstone's first speech, the Ministerialists, whilst recognising the necessity of certain modifications of the scheme as unfolded by their chief, were on the whole hopeful that the second reading of the Bill would, in spite of the defection of the Whigs, be agreed to by a fair majority. Day by day, however, their hopes became darker. The withdrawal of the Irish members from Westminster met with very slender approval in any quarter, and the fact that the proposal received such warm support from the Irish themselves was regarded as evidence that they looked upon it as a token of separation. The need, therefore, of some concessions on their part became paramount, and the first symptom appeared in a semi-official correction of an adjective employed by the Prime Minister in introducing his Bill. According to the received report, Mr. Gladstone was made

to say that the exclusion of the Irish members and the maintenance of the fiscal unity of the Empire were "two vital propositions, and essential parts of the foundation of the Bill." In the place of the word "vital" it was said that "initiatory" had been used, and that the word "essential" was equally misrepresented. Parliament and the public expected some authoritative statement to this effect in Mr. Gladstone's reply at the close of the debate, especially as the objections of the Radicals were based almost entirely on the Government views on Irish representation. But Mr. Gladstone skilfully avoided giving any definite assurance that the obnoxious principle should be withdrawn from the Bill before the second reading; and, when Parliament rose for the Easter holidays and members were brought face to face with their constituents, this stumbling-block to so many had not been even partially removed. The reason for this hesitation was, it was said, due to Mr. John Morley's attitude, and his determination to resign the Chief Secretaryship if the Irish members were to continue to sit at Westminster. If this were so, the struggle almost resolved itself into a personal one; and the Prime Minister was called upon to decide between the two candidates for the honour of acting as his chief lieutenant. Mr. Gladstone's hesitation was not of long duration; and the hopes, too, of a reconciliation between him and Mr. Chamberlain, which grew strong on the introduction of the Land Purchase Bill, soon faded away, and before many days were gone by it became patent that the chances of a reunion of the Radicals were remote. Meanwhile the Conservatives had lost no time in organising throughout the country public meetings, at which they raised the watch-cry of the "dismemberment of the Empire," and pressed into their ranks not a few of the moderate Liberals who were unprepared for so rapid a revolution. The meeting held in Her Majesty's Theatre, although it met with the disapproval of many of the constituents of the Liberal members who took part in it, was the most important of these outward evidences of an approaching understanding between the Conservatives and the anti-Home Rule Liberals, the latter of whom found their ranks daily recruited by men whose divergence on other points of the Liberal programme was well known. Amongst these were Mr. John Bright, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Henry Brand, and others; and when Mr. Reginald Brett's letter to the *Times* appeared (April 21) advocating an immediate dissolution as offering the best chance of reuniting the Liberal party, not a few of the steadiest supporters of the Government supported the suggestion. Mr. Gladstone, however, decided otherwise, misled perhaps by the numerous votes of confidence in his policy passed by local Liberal committees throughout the country, the most strongly worded assurances of support not unfrequently coming from constituencies of which the representatives had shown lukewarmness or expressed hostility to the Government Bill. There were

however, other methods to testify the feeling of the country more accurately, and no time was lost in organising meetings where Ministers might bring themselves face to face with the electorate. It was hoped, also, that in these speeches some of the doubts which still existed as to the points which the Ministers considered essential would be brushed away, and that their readiness to sacrifice those which awakened widespread hostility and dismay would be hinted at. The campaign was opened with a meeting in the Town Hall at Newcastle-on-Tyne (April 22), where Earl Spencer and Mr. John Morley appeared to defend the Irish policy of the Government. The former naturally referred at some length to the change which had come over his opinions since he had left Dublin Castle in the previous summer. Since that time he had become impressed with the fact that both in our benevolent and coercive policy in Ireland we had never adopted the views of the leaders of the Irish people, but had treated them with unreasoning mistrust. He had learned by long experience that we had ruled Ireland by fear—not through the sympathy of the people—and therefore we had failed. It was the formal abandonment of coercion by the Conservatives on coming into power that had altered Lord Spencer's views; for it made it impossible for any Liberal Administration to revert to the system. He was not surprised at the result of the General Election, for he had always thought that Mr. Parnell would have four-fifths of the Irish members as his followers; but he was astonished at the miserable weakness of his opponents. They were nowhere, outside of Ulster—not even in Dublin—able to ward off a crushing defeat. The National party were so powerful that, in order to get the self-government of the country into its own hands, the remedial laws which had been passed with so much difficulty for the protection of the loyalists were of no avail. Law and order were maintained, but only by fear; and, as it was impossible to prolong exceptional legislation indefinitely, it was necessary to find a remedy. Lord Spencer then dealt with the argument that the government of Ireland would be handed over to men who had encouraged or perhaps directed outrage and crime. "I have been," he said, "in a position to know nearly all that has taken place, and the evidence that has been given in regard to the murders and conspiracies to murder which took place in 1881–82, and I can say without hesitation that I have never heard or seen any evidence of complicity in crime against any of the Irish representatives. It is right that I should distinctly express my condemnation of many of the methods by which they carried on their agitations. They often used language and arguments that were as unjustifiable as they were unfounded. They sometimes, perhaps on financial grounds, were silent when words would have been golden. They may even have employed for their own legitimate purposes men who had been employed in illegal acts. But I for one believe these

men to have affection for, and a real interest in the welfare of their country." After paying a tribute to the abilities of the Irish members, Lord Spencer touched upon the land question which he regarded as the root of many of the feuds in Ireland and, in view of the existing feeling, he said: "I do not for moment think that it would be just or honest in the British Parliament to leave unprotected and uncared for the landlord of Ireland. We have at various times curtailed their rights by Acts of Parliament, and I think it would be a mean and treacherous thing at this moment if we did not defend what we consider their just interests. I believe, also, it would be most unfair on the new Irish Assembly to leave this question of the land unsettled. I have been credited, I don't know why, with holding a different view from, or a stronger view than, many of my colleagues on the land scheme. I am not aware of this, for I believe that my colleagues and I are agreed on this as on the other subjects connected with the measure. Mr. Gladstone himself has said that the two questions are inseparable." Lord Spencer went on to say that he believed that the Irish would keep the pledges made in their name, and that there was no risk of their repudiating their liabilities to the English exchequer. He denied, moreover, that the Irish were going to take Home Rule as an instalment, or that they really wanted separation. The cost of maintaining an army and a navy, the need of keeping up the credit of their country, would effectually prevent any such movement gaining ground, although it might be proposed by certain fanatics and rebels. To put down these would be one of the first acts and duties of Mr. Parnell when he became Minister for Ireland. Lord Spencer then concluded his speech which throughout had been received with strongly marked sympathy and approval. "I have pointed out how impossible it was to follow the old methods of government. I have shown you that the road which Mr. Gladstone has taken is the only one which you ought to follow. If I thought that that policy would lead to dismemberment of the Empire, if I thought it would lead to separation, if I thought it would involve the repudiation of debts, if I thought it would stir up enmity between the various classes in Ireland, if I thought it would raise religious intolerance in the country, I for one should not have raised my voice in support of it. I have no such fear. I have confidence that the Irish constituencies will return members to Parliament who will be faithful to their trust, and that among them the mercantile, learned, and intellectual classes of the community will be represented, and that these men will be ready to do their best to solve the problems before them. The policy we have in view is to make strong the real union—a policy to restore efficiency to our own Parliament, a policy which in my own mind is the only one left which will restore to Ireland happiness and contentment, and a policy which I sincerely and devoutly trust will be carried to a successful issue."

Mr. John Morley's reception by his constituents was not less hearty, and throughout his speech it was evident that his attitude towards Mr. Gladstone and his conduct in reference to Ireland was thoroughly endorsed by the Tyneside population. He began by referring to the reproaches showered on him for his allusion to American desperadoes. There were, he said, in the ranks of the Irish Nationalists in Ireland and in America moderate men who, by constitutional means, wished to bring the eternal quarrel between England and Ireland to an honest end. There were also violent men who wished, for purposes of their own, to keep the quarrel open. What he had said was that to reject these Bills was to do that which the violent and unconstitutional men most desired—namely, to play into the hands of those whose ambition and business was to keep the fire between England and Ireland in full blast. When the Irish Government was established it would make a very much shorter work with evildoers than even the English had been able to do. He had never meant the difficulty of restoring order in Ireland as an argument standing by itself. It was only one among many other considerations which ought to weigh in the minds of the public. The great honour and glory of Mr. Gladstone and those who had joined him was, he considered, that they faced the great problem full to the front. They were not going to stand by like a parcel of loitering, shivering, irresolute Hamlets, cursing the time for being out of joint, and the spite that had made them put it right. "With reference to the self-government of Ireland, 'to be or not to be' is not the question. What is admitted to be at the root of all the mischief in Ireland is that Irishmen have never had responsibility. I put before you this proposition, that Irishmen cannot have responsibility without power. They cannot have power without their running and our running some risks. The proposition on which the policy of the present Government depends is this, that we are willing, and even bound, to run some risks in order to give to Irishmen that degree of power which shall teach them, in the only way in which the lesson can be taught, that responsibility which fits men for freedom and for a place in a free constitutional system."

Mr. Morley admitted that there was no lack of alternatives; but none of them would be accepted by the Irish people. The Bill contained points to which Liberals might fairly object; but the object of its framers was to satisfy all interests; and, although Radicals would naturally resent the creation of a legislative body for the representation of the Protestant and propertied minority, this was done in order to appease the misgivings and mistrust of the Conservatives. With regard to the retention or exclusion of the Irish members at Westminster, Mr. Morley expressed his belief that all his colleagues were ready to listen fully to any definite plan for retaining them. "*For my part, I bargain that it must be a plan that will work.*"



I have heard as yet of no such plan. If you accept this policy of retaining the Irish members at Westminster, I want to know on what terms you are going to retain them. If you take the test of contribution to imperial charges you will, of course, have to reduce their numbers. In so doing, what is the number to be fixed at? If you take the test of their contribution to the imperial charges, which is but one-fifteenth, their number would be actually between forty and forty-five. The population of Ireland is about one-seventh of that of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. If you take that test you will send I think, about ninety-five members to Parliament. How are these members, whether they are forty-five or ninety-five, to be chosen? They might be chosen by the Irish legislative body and sent as a sort of Parliamentary delegation; but, if taxation without representation is an anomaly in our constitution, still more, to send members to Westminster who have not been freely immediately, and directly chosen by constituencies, is an innovation upon the whole character of the House of Commons, which far exceeds anything else that I have heard of. You will have weakened, by the withdrawal of able men, the legislature of Dublin, and you will have demoralised the legislature at Westminster. We know very well what that demoralisation means, for I beg you to mark attentively the use to which the Irish members would inevitably put their votes—inevitably and naturally. Those who make most of the retention of the Irish members at Westminster are also those to make most of there being what they call a real and effective and a freely and constantly exercised veto at Westminster upon the doings at Dublin. You see the position. A legislative body in Dublin passes a Bill. The idea is that that Bill is to lie upon the table of the two Houses of Parliament in London for forty days—forty days in the wilderness! That means that every question that had been fought out in Ireland would be fought out over again by the Irish members in our Parliament. It means that the House of Lords here would throw out pretty nearly every Bill that was passed at Dublin. What would be the result of that? You would have the present block of our business; you would have all the present irritation and exasperation. English work would not be done; Irish feelings would not be conciliated, but would be exasperated. For my part I cannot see how an arrangement of that sort promises well either for the condition of Ireland or for our Parliament. We offer you—our opponents cannot deny it—we offer you what the Irish leaders accept as a settlement and I for one believe that the Irish landlords and the Irish people will be as good as their word. We have brought in our Bills, and though—I think I may speak for my colleagues—we do not postulate acceptance for every line and every clause of these two Bills as a saving and necessary article of faith, we say that on the lines of these Bills you may build a fabric of peace if

Ireland. We may say that on the central and fundamental proposition of the first Bill—namely, that there shall be a separate legislative assembly in Dublin—we say that, starting from that point, you may go well to the end of your journey.”

It would be impossible within reasonable limits to refer even cursorily to the speeches and letters with which the papers were flooded. Some of the severest criticisms came from Mr. Gladstone's former colleagues. It was difficult even for Mr. Gladstone to persuade a large body of his own supporters that the Irish Nationalists whom he had a few years previously denounced with so much fervour were suddenly transformed from implacable enemies into constitutional supporters of the Throne and of the integrity of the Empire. From nearly every quarter the Irish Bills were criticised with unflagging vigour, and fresh objections to their working were put forward on every platform, giving force to Lord R. Churchill's gibe that the conception of the Irish policy of the Government had shattered one conviction of the Liberal party, and its production shattered another. Mr. Gladstone's personal influence, which in 1868, and again in 1880, was as unbounded as it was unquestioned, had sensibly declined during his last tenure of office, as was evidenced by the results of the General Election of 1885; and it was no longer in his power to impose upon the Liberal party a measure which did not commend itself as much to their reason as to their enthusiasm. The Duke of Argyll at Glasgow (April 21) pointed out that Mr. Gladstone, in explaining why the pensioning of the Irish judges was necessary, had given as his reason that they would “be placed in relations more or less uneasy, and with what under the new constitution will in all probability be the dominating influence in the country.” The duke asked why Mr. Gladstone had stopped at the judges, since, in the suppression of crime, special jurymen empanelled under the Crimes Act deserved as much protection and sympathy. He further showed that clause 19 of the Bill, empowering the Irish Council to appropriate any part of the Irish revenue to the endowment of any form of religion, was in absolute contradiction with the 4th clause, which forbade the enacting of any law to the same effect. Lord Selborne (Mr. Gladstone's Lord Chancellor in his previous Administration) addressed a letter to the *Times* (April 23), as one who had shared the responsibility of the Irish Land Act and other measures, but who could not remain longer a silent spectator of a crisis graver than anything which had occurred in his time. He said that, when in the previous December he first had reason to believe that there was some foundation for the “unauthorised” announcement of Mr. Gladstone's intention, he put his thought in the form of a memorandum, which he communicated to some of his former colleagues, including (apparently) Mr. Gladstone.

“I said that, whatever else might be doubtful about any

project for an Irish Parliament, three things were clear: first, that a constitutional change of that magnitude and moment could not be accepted by any reasonable and conscientious politician on mere party grounds, or out of deference only to the authority of any political leader; secondly, that such a man ought not to be deterred by difficulties or fears from doing, in so great a matter, what he considered necessary for the honour and safety of the country; and, thirdly, that if he thought the honour or safety of the country might be dangerously compromised by such an experiment without proper safeguards, or because proper safeguards were impossible, he ought to oppose it to the utmost of his power. If Ireland were to remain under the British Crown, 'it must surely,' I added, 'be an indispensable condition of any form of Home Rule that there should be some real security for the lives, liberties, and properties of all the Queen's loyal subjects there—landlords as well as peasants, Protestants as well as Roman Catholics.' I thought that 'to abandon the classes most attached to British connection, and leave them to the risk of confiscation and proscription by their avowed enemies while maintaining the nominal supremacy of Great Britain, would be the lowest depth of dishonour.' "

After dwelling on the absence of any real securities for the lives, liberties, and properties of the Queen's loyal subjects in Ireland, Lord Selborne added: "It is upon the Land Bill, and that alone, that Mr. Gladstone appears to place his reliance for the protection of the loyal subjects of the Crown . . . but I did not in my memorandum regard any scheme of that sort as practical. That Ireland could not (and would not if she could) pay the necessary price for buying out the landowners seemed to me obvious; and I thought it most improbable that the people of Great Britain could be induced to do so for the sake of purchasing at the enormous cost which would be necessary for the purpose the disintegration of the Empire and the surrender of Ireland into the Nationalist hands."

Still greater interest attached to the meeting of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain with their respective constituents. The former on two critical occasions had found reasons for voting against Mr. Gladstone, and the Liberal Council for the Rossendale Division of Lancashire saw in these acts of independence a violation of his duties towards the Liberal electors. Lord Hartington willingly offered to explain the course he had adopted. At the private meeting of the Liberal Council (April 26) he briefly stated that he had voted against Mr. Jesse Collings's amendment because he thought that such an amendment to the Address could only raise false hopes and lead to disappointment. With regard to the Irish question, he said it was his strong conviction that the Conservatives should have been allowed fully *to disclose their policy* before any step was taken by the Liberals.

In the evening, Lord Hartington addressed a crowded public meeting, at which his reception was the reverse of cordial or enthusiastic. A letter from Mr. John Bright, which was read before Lord Hartington spoke, expressed the conviction that the attitude of the latter had been thoroughly consistent with true Liberalism. "It would be a calamity for the country," he wrote, "if measures of such transcendent magnitude were to be accepted on the authority of a leader of a party, or of a Minister, however eminent; that no other member of the party was to be permitted to hold or to express strong doubts, or even adverse opinions, of the measures proposed. For constituencies to accept this system would be to betray their value in the working of representative institutions." Lord Hartington began his speech, which was frequently interrupted, by expressing his regret and pain at being forced to separate himself, if only for a time, from those with whom it had been his pride and his privilege to work; but he was forced to the conclusion that the measures submitted to Parliament for the government of Ireland were measures opposed equally to the best traditions of the Liberal party and to the recent professions of the great majority of the representatives of the Liberal party; that they were not called for by any present emergency, and were not likely to remove any of the evils under which Ireland had so long suffered, but rather to intensify and prolong the division which had existed between the two countries. With regard to the meeting called by the Loyal and Patriotic Union, held at Her Majesty's Theatre, Lord Hartington declared that it was in no sense a Conservative meeting, and by his attendance there he had given no adherence to Conservative politics. "I have retracted no word of condemnation or censure which I have uttered in regard to Conservative policy, and in regard to any question which is at issue between Liberals and Conservatives outside this question of the future government of Ireland, I hold that I am as free and as uncommitted as I ever was. Much as I value the unity of the Liberal party, I value the unity of the British Empire much more, and I will not be prevented by any party consideration from doing what in my opinion may be best fitted to maintain that union." Lord Hartington then went on to show how many statesmen of distinction, whose Liberalism was above suspicion, had objected to the Bills—pronounced by Mr. Gladstone to be inseparable—in their present form; and although he was not an irreconcilable opponent any more than Mr. Chamberlain, yet the modifications requisite to please the various opponents of the two Bills would so utterly transform and alter their character that Mr. Gladstone would find it impossible to advocate their adoption by Parliament. He then recapitulated the objections he had previously urged against the Home Rule Bill, declaring that the description given of the measures—that they were simply measures to enable the Irish to manage their own affairs—was altogether fallacious. The first step of deciding who were

the people of Ireland had never been fairly taken ; and he maintained that the first appeal of the Protestant minority of Ireland against the ascendancy of the Catholic majority would arouse in Protestant England a feeling productive of far greater disturbance than had ever yet occurred in Ireland. Lord Hartington further maintained that it would be useless to talk about maintaining the supremacy of the Parliament at Westminster whilst the Irish executive was responsible to the Parliament in Dublin alone ; that by the exclusion of the Irish members from Westminster, coupled with the payment to Ireland of the sum provided for in the Land Purchase Bill, a more fruitful source of friction than had ever before arisen would be created. As for the limitation of the amount to be paid to the landlords, he added that, inasmuch as the principle of the Bill was that every landlord was to have the option of disposing of his Irish property to British taxpayers, the sum the latter would be responsible for would be nearer 200 millions than 50 millions. The Rossendale Liberals, whilst refusing to pass censure on their member, were still more decided not to express approval in his conduct. After much hesitation, however, they agreed to a resolution thanking Lord Hartington for his speech and expressing the hope that "such measures will be passed as will tend to the peace and prosperity of Great Britain and Ireland."

Mr. Chamberlain, outwardly at least, had been more successful in satisfying the wishes of the Liberal "Two Thousand"—although he signified more clearly than Lord Hartington his divergence from their former leader. He declared that it was the very irony of fate that they should be met on that occasion to discuss a question which had never entered their thoughts a few months previously when engaged in the General Election.

"What," he asked, "has produced this great change in the situation? There is nothing new, there is nothing that was unexpected in the condition of Ireland. There has been no popular demand in England or in Scotland. Let us recognise the fact: the whole change is due to the force of character, to the determination—ay, I will say to the courage—of one great, illustrious man; and, although I regret the object for which these qualities have been displayed, I will say to you that never before has my admiration for them been so sincere and profound. . . . I do not believe that there has been any Radical, any Liberal of note, who has hitherto, until very recently indeed, doubted that with the removal of the material grievances of Ireland this desire for separation would cease and die away. The situation has changed just at the time when a Parliament has been elected, strengthened by an infusion of influence and support, and more ready than any Parliament that has ever existed to do justice to Ireland, to secure absolute equality between the three kingdoms, and to remove every grievance *against which a reasonable claim could be set out.*"



After criticising in detail some of the provisions of the Irish Government Bill, he said that, if the proposals were accepted at all by the Irish, it was only as an instalment; it would be a justification for future demands. They had to consider, not the safeguards and restrictions, but whether they would accept what would undoubtedly follow when those restrictions and safeguards were removed and Ireland became an independent and a foreign country, and the integrity of the empire became an empty name. Mr. Davitt, who was a really honest patriot, had been asked whether Irishmen would be satisfied with these arrangements, and would accept them as a permanent settlement of the question. Mr. Davitt's reply had been that it was as unreasonable as to ask him, after he had had his breakfast, to refrain from demanding his dinner and his supper. Mr. Chamberlain felt sure that the demand for dinner and supper would quickly follow, and that it could not then be resisted. He noticed that we had been too much accustomed to talk of Ireland as if it were one people. But there were, he urged, two nations in Ireland—two communities, separated by religion, by race, by politics, by social conditions.

Turning to the Land Bill, he contended that the reduction of the responsibility from 113 millions to fifty was perfectly illusory. It was a mere alteration of the paper estimate—no alteration of the plan itself. An option of selling his land on certain terms was to be offered to every landlord in Ireland. If they all accepted the option we could not possibly escape the entire obligation of 150 millions. If he were in their place, he should certainly accept it. Going on to contend that the Irish tenants would be both unable and unwilling to pay those rents which would be fixed by the judicial rents, he added :—

“Working men of England and Scotland, where is your remedy? You will be Irish landlords; you will have to evict the tenants; you will have to collect your rents at the point of the bayonet, and I refuse to be a party to such contingencies.”

With reference to his attitude towards the two Bills, Mr. Chamberlain said that he feared that his objections to the proposals contained in the Land Bill were fundamental. “I think the Bill a bad one. I would sooner go out of politics altogether than give my vote to pledge the capital of the country—ay, and the future earnings of every man and woman in the United Kingdom—in order to modify the opposition of a small class of Irish proprietors to a scheme which, if it remain in its present form, will, I believe, infallibly lead to the separation of Ireland from England. I object in this case to the risk which we are asked to incur; I object also to the object for which we are asked to incur that risk. But as regards the Home Rule Bill—the Bill for the Better Government of Ireland—my opposition is only conditional. The only question is as to the form which

the Bill shall assume, and I think I can show you in a few words that if certain alterations were made all the anomalies which I have described to you, most of the objections which I have taken, would disappear. . . . I sincerely hope that Mr. Gladstone, who I have no doubt has all these matters fully before him, will see his way to accept these modifications. If he does, it is with real gratification and delight that I shall be found once more giving him whatever humble support I can ; but, if not, then my duty is clear, and at all hazards I will perform it. I am not going to enter any cave, I am not going to join any coalition of discordant elements and parties, but in the case I have mentioned I shall give an independent, but I hope also a perfectly frank and loyal, opposition to the measures which in my heart and conscience I believe, in their present form, will be disastrous and dangerous to the best interests of the United Kingdom."

A vote of "unabated confidence" in Mr. Chamberlain was passed with only two dissentients. This was followed by a proposal that before proceeding further an adjournment should be made to another day to consider the matter more deliberately after Mr. Chamberlain's speech. This course was deprecated by Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Jesse Collings, who argued that a decisive vote should be taken that night. Accordingly a resolution was proposed, and carried by an overwhelming majority, expressing confidence in Mr. Gladstone in his efforts to make a permanent settlement of the Irish question, and heartily approving of his proposals to entrust the people of Ireland with a large control over their domestic affairs ; recognising in the Irish Bill of the Government a foundation of such settlement, but trusting the amendments suggested and others that might be desirable would be accepted by the Government, but deprecating a mode of settlement by which British credit to an indefinite extent would be pledged to the compensation of Irish landlords.

In other districts there was a similar halting between two opinions—fealty to Mr. Gladstone and fidelity to the unity of the empire. In the North of England, especially in Durham and Northumberland, all sections of Liberals seemed favourably disposed towards a speedy settlement of the question. The Radicals expressed dislike to the proposed Second Chamber, with its peerage and property qualification and its own veto ; but even on the more important point of the exclusion of the Irish members from Westminster, they were ready to sacrifice their own opinions to general convenience. The Land Bill, however was looked upon either with coldness or actual antagonism and the generally expressed feeling was to the effect that, if the landlords would not assist in passing the two Bills at Westminster, they should be left to settle the land question at Dublin.

North of the Tweed Mr. Gladstone's proposals, whilst awaken

ing a desire for Home Rule for Scotland, scarcely met with the hearty reception their author may have anticipated. Whilst, however, the Scotch Liberals leaned rather towards the idea of Imperial Federation, they were for the most part indisposed to give up the representation of Scotland at Westminster, and consequently urged the retention there of the Irish members also. The religious rights of the minority, moreover, in their eyes needed greater protection, and against the Land Purchase scheme all sections were united.

Mr. Caine, whose previous election at Barrow had brought to light the divergence of Liberal opinions, in an address to his constituents (April 28) said unless the Liberal party was to be split up into shivers it was necessary the different sections should approach one another in no hostile or bitter spirit, but with the earnest determination, by means of mutual concessions, to come to some agreement on this terrible Irish trouble which shall settle it once for all, and enable Parliament to give its undivided attention to those English questions which were quite as important. He frankly admitted that he was compelled, by the fact that these proposals had been submitted by Mr. Gladstone's Administration, to take a long step forward towards Home Rule for Ireland, far beyond the position he had taken up during the recent election, but at the same time he had five grave objections, all of which would have to be removed before he could give his cordial support to Mr. Gladstone's scheme. First, the exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament; second, the composition of the Irish Legislative Assembly; third, imperial taxation in Ireland must be under the control of the Imperial Parliament; fourth, the power of veto ought not to rest with a first order in the Irish Parliament, but with the Imperial Parliament, in which the Irish representatives should sit; and, fifthly, he objected entirely to the Land Purchase Bill.

Mr. Courtney in Cornwall found himself, like Lord Hartington in Lancashire, in presence of a half-hostile body of constituents, but his prompt and vigorous defence of the absolute consistency of his conduct (April 29) was followed by a vote of confidence which proved that his arguments had not been thrown away. He maintained that the measures proposed might perhaps postpone the settlement of the Irish difficulty, but they did not solve it. Home Rule, he insisted, would be positively injurious to Ireland, on the showing of the Irish leaders, for they based their hopes of the revival of Irish industry and commerce on the principle of protection. He then went on to argue that if all the arguments against Home Rule were to be put aside on the plea of some higher expediency, then the Government proposals stopped short of what was requisite to meet the aspirations of Ireland, and a separate national existence should be frankly and openly conceded to her.

From these and similar utterances it was becoming clear

that Mr. Gladstone's hold even over his former colleagues was greatly relaxed, and that the optimism of the Ministerialists who at first affected to disregard as unimportant the defects of Lord Hartington and half a dozen others, was likely to be disappointed. The formation of a Liberal Committee for maintaining the Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland at once received the adhesion of twenty-eight Liberal members amongst whom were some of the most influential members of previous Administrations. Each day brought fresh accessions to their ranks; and the number of those who had, it was said, expressed an intention to vote against the second reading of the Irish Government Bill rose rapidly to fifty, and, according to some reports, to seventy. In the presence of such hostility was announced, probably in order to sound public feeling, that Mr. Gladstone might be induced to accept the second reading as a mere declaration in favour of the principle of Home Rule, and then to withdraw the present Bills and introduce at an autumn session a measure in which the points which had aroused much difference of opinion among Liberals would be softened or absent. To stem the tide of public opinion, which even in Scotland was apparently running counter to Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Morley was despatched to Glasgow to rouse the flagging energies of the Scotch Liberals, and to reply to the criticisms which had been levelled against the Bill. At a meeting held under the auspices of the National Liberal Federation of Scotland (April 30) the Irish Secretary insisted that no charge was more unfounded than that the Irish question had been sprung upon the party by surprise. Having proposed their plan, the Government did not find it without rivals; but the fact was, there was no other plan put forward that had not been laughed out of court already. As to the question being referred to a committee, there was on one to which it could, and that was the committee of responsible Ministers of the Queen for the time being. Mr. Morley urged moreover, that the proposals of giving county government and erecting local boards would not have been accepted as even the pretence of a settlement by the leaders of the Irish party.

Mr. Morley then went on to argue that all who were in favour of some sort of statutory Parliament were morally bound to vote for the second reading of the Government Bill. "But we, who had to frame a measure, who had to decide what this statutory Parliament was to be, and under what conditions it was to work, could not come before Parliament and come before the country with a bald declaration of that kind. We had to construct a complete scheme and a working plan. It is not a cast-iron Bill. We should have been very foolish, knowing the enormous difficulties and complexities of framing a constitution for a country, if we had come down with every 't' crossed and every 'i' dotted. Our plan in its operation will be a plan of great flexibility of adaptation to a great variety of circumstances in Ireland as they arise. The more our plan is studied, the

more, in my firm conviction, will you see that it is framed to meet all contingencies that can be foreseen; and there is no feature of it that I, for my part, view with more satisfaction than this flexibility of adaptation, which I believe, when and if our Bill becomes law, will be found to be its working merit."

As to the chance of there being friction between the Irish Government and the British Government, Mr. Morley said he defied an archangel from heaven to frame a system under which there would be no risk of friction between Great Britain and Ireland.

On the same evening, Lord Hartington and Mr. Goschen spoke at Edinburgh to a large meeting, presided over by the Earl of Stair, when the first-named maintained at some length that, if there was to be a severance between the leaders of the Liberal party, it was due to those who were attempting to force forward a measure opposed to true Liberal principles. He deprecated also the haste and impatience with which the so-called remedial legislation was being pressed, suggesting distrust of their previous efforts. The great Land Act was but five years old, and its last amendment, the Land Purchase Act, not twelve months; and yet the Irish people were to be told that those who had land there had no confidence in their results. Mr. Goschen, who followed, said that the danger was that the Irish Bills, if passed, would be passed by phrases such as "Justice to Ireland," "Generosity to our Fellow-subjects," "Irish Managing their own Affairs," and the like. He denied the "generosity" of a measure which entrusted not English lives and property to an Irish Parliament, but the lives and property of a million and a quarter loyalists in Ireland. If the Purchase scheme was generous, where was its security; and, if it was secure, where was the generosity? He pointed out the extent of power granted to the Irish Parliament, which could suspend the Habeas Corpus Act in Ulster, abolish the penalty of death, or reduce the interest on all mortgages by one-half. It could recast the Civil Service, or remodel the Education Act. If the Irish members were to remain in the House, the Irish Parliament would be cut down to a National Council; while if we retained a real veto, every Irish question would be rediscussed. Mr. Goschen declared the constitution of the Irish Parliament opposed to English Liberal traditions, and exposed the financial provisions of the Bill when coupled with the Land Purchase scheme. He ended with a fine defence of his colleagues against the charge of being reactionaries, and against the confusion between coercion and the repression of crime, and warned his hearers to take care lest, as the Union had been carried by bribery, disruption should be carried by bribery too—bribery to Irish landlords, to Irish peasants, to Irish judges, to Irish civil servants, and to English Radicals, who, once Ireland was out of the way, were promised endless legislation.



Mr. Gladstone was not slow in following up the blow struck by his lieutenant in defence of the Bill. A letter addressed to his Midlothian constituents, dated from Hawarden (May 1) expressed his regret at not being able to take an active part in the campaign of the Easter recess. Increasing age obliged him to reserve his limited powers of voice for the demands of the House of Commons. He, therefore, had recourse to his pen and revert to the topic which he had opened in his address of the previous autumn. Mr. Gladstone began by reverting to what he had said in his address to his constituents in the previous autumn as furnishing the key to his subsequent course of action. "I then said that any concession of self-government to Ireland which was duly adjusted to the paramount conditions of imperial unity would, in my opinion, be a source not of danger, but of increased security and strength to the empire." He had therefore, on his return to office introduced a measure of which, although some important provisions had provoked differences of opinion among his friends, yet it had met with "wide and warm approval in the country, where it was felt 'that the principle of local autonomy, or Home Rule, for Ireland is reasonable; and the demands of imperial unity have at least been carefully studied.'" He laid great stress upon the favour with which his measure had been received by the British and Irish spread over the world.

"From public meetings and from the highest authorities in the colonies and America, from capitals such as Washington, Boston, and Quebec, and from remote districts lying beyond the reach of all ordinary political excitement, I receive conclusive assurances that the kindred people regard with warm and fraternal sympathy our present effort to settle on an adequate scale and once for all the long-vexed and troubled relations between Great Britain and Ireland, which exhibits to us the one and only conspicuous failure of the political genius of our race to confront and master difficulty and to obtain in a reasonable degree the main ends of a civilised life. We must not be discouraged if at home, and particularly in the upper ranks of society, we hear a variety of discordant notes—notes alike discordant from our policy and from one another. Gentlemen, you have before you a Cabinet determined in its purpose, and an intelligible plan. I own I see very little else in the political arena that is determined or that is intelligible."

Passing on to the position of the measures before Parliament, he left the Land Purchase Bill to stand on the declarations already made with respect to its object, "adding only an expression of the regret with which I find that, while the sands are running in the hour-glass, the Irish landlords have as yet given no inclination of a desire to accept a proposal framed in the spirit of the utmost allowable regard to their apprehensions as to *their interests*." Recognising the right of Liberal leaders to

Lord Hartington and Mr. Bright, whose absolute integrity and manly courage in this controversy he found it a pleasure to acknowledge, he earnestly urged them to recall the history of previous divisions in the Liberal party; in which, as he maintained, time had shown that the party were right and the seceders wrong. In the present instance, the secession, however estimable in other ways, was as to positive policy for Ireland a perfect Babel. The speeches of his opponents, Liberal as well as Tory, Mr. Gladstone declared were marked by one remarkable omission. "Whether they suggest or whether they only criticise, one thing they almost unanimously fail to do—they fail to express confidence in the permanent success of their opposition. To live from hand to mouth appears to be the height of their ambition. They seem to suspect what we well know, that the strife which they are stirring can only end one way—can only end in the concession of self-government to Ireland. If this be so, then the real question before us is not the triumph of Irish autonomy, but the length and character of the struggle by which it is to be preceded. We say let it be short; they seek to make it long. We say let us give freely; they say, by their acts if not in words, let us only give when we can no longer withhold. They would postpone the settlement until a day when demands may be larger and means of resistance less; we say deal with this matter as a matter between brothers—a matter of justice and of reason. They renew the tale—alas! too often told—which has for its prologue denial with exasperation and resentment; and for its epilogue, surrender without conditions and without thanks."

Mr. Gladstone, further to emphasise his belief in the future of Home Rule, declared his conviction that, subject to primary imperial obligations, a standard measure of good government for Scotland and for Wales would be eventually determined by the public opinion of those countries. With regard to the opposition aroused to the Bill, he said: "On the side adverse to the Government are found, as I sorrowfully admit, in profuse abundance, station, title, wealth, social influence, the professions, or the large majority of them—in a word, the spirit and power of class. These are the main body of the opposing host. Nor is this all. As knights of old had squires, so in the great army of class each enrolled soldier has, as a rule, dependants. The adverse host, then, consists of class and the dependants of class. But this formidable army is in the bulk of its constituent parts the same, though now enriched at our cost with a valuable contingent of recruits, that has fought in every one of the great political battles of the last sixty years and has been defeated. We have had great controversies before this great controversy—on free trade, free navigation, public education, religious equality in civil matters, extension of the suffrage to its present basis. On these and many other great issues the classes have fought uniformly *on the wrong side*, and have uniformly been beat-

by a power more difficult to marshal, but resistless when marshalled—by the upright sense of the nation.”

In conclusion, he urged his constituents not to be drawn away from the main issues before them—which were “to restore Parliament to efficiency by dividing and removing obstacles to its work; to treat the Irish question with a due regard to its specialties, but with the same thoroughness of method by which we have solved colonial problems that fifty years back were hardly if at all less formidable; to give heed to the voice of a people speaking in tones of moderation by the mouth of a vast majority of those whom we ourselves have made its constitutional representatives, and thus to strengthen and consolidate the empire on the basis of mutual benefit and hearty loyalty. Such is the end. For the means we take the establishment in Dublin of a legislative body empowered to make laws for Irish as contrasted distinguished from imperial affairs. It is with this that we are now busied, and not with details and particulars. Their time will come. . . . We are not now debating the amount of Irish contributions to the empire, or the composition of the legislative body, or the maintenance of a representative connection with Westminster. On these questions, and many more, we may or may not be at odds; but what we are at this moment debating is the large and far larger question which includes, and I think absorbs, them all—whether you will or will not have regard to the prayer of Ireland for the management by herself of the affairs specifically and exclusively her own. This and no other is the matter which the House of Commons has at once to decide. If on this matter it speaks with a clear and intelligible voice, I feel the strongest assurance that the others, difficult as some of them are, will nevertheless, with the aid of full discussion—with the aid of a wise and conciliatory spirit—be found capable of a rational and tolerable settlement.”

In the criticism which Mr. Gladstone's manifesto provoked there was no evidence that it had encouraged his friends or brought conviction to his opponents. It was regarded rather as a rhetorical appeal to the feelings than as an attempt to confute the logical objections which had been raised to the Home Rule policy. Nevertheless, it undoubtedly furnished the Liberal association throughout the country with material for resolutions in favour of Mr. Gladstone; and it speedily became evident that these local bodies were much more in favour of Mr. Gladstone than were the members whom they had returned a few months previously. Allusion has been made to what passed at Rawtenstall and Birmingham; but at the conference of the National Reform Union held at Manchester, the divergence was even more marked, for although most of the speeches made were against the Bill, no resolution hostile to the Bill was tolerated. Under these circumstances it was not surprising that the Ministerial supporter *looked forward* with complacency to the results of the division.

on the second reading; the most hopeful placing their majority at twenty-three, and the least sanguine at three, according as the influence of the local committees might be successful in detaching many or few of the 111 Liberal seceders who had expressed their objection to the Bill as first introduced.

Meanwhile the Scotch campaign, inaugurated at Glasgow by Mr. John Morley and at Edinburgh by Lord Hartington, was followed up by a speech from Mr. Goschen at Paisley (May 1), in the course of which he said that the Irish Secretary had avoided the question which the Liberal Unionists were submitting to the constituencies—that it was not fifty millions, but more than one hundred millions that would be needed under the Land Purchase Bill of the Government. Mr. Goschen urged, moreover, that the Imperial Parliament would remain responsible for all that was done in Ireland, but no shadow of argument had been brought forward to show that we should retain any power over the Irish Executive to compel them to observe those international duties which we must observe, otherwise we should have to pay dearly for their neglect. Ireland, moreover, under the Bill would never have to pay increased contributions in the case of war, or to bear any additional burden, even if the empire should be engaged in a death struggle: nevertheless, England would have no power so to control the actions of the Executive in Ireland as to prevent international complications which might lead to the war to which Ireland would not contribute one pound. Referring to the guarantees in the bill, he remarked with respect to the veto:—

“At last, after waiting for some time, the country has got, through Mr. Morley’s lips, some idea of what the imperial veto is to be. He said the veto would be exercised under the responsibility of a British Ministry. But what is this veto? Is Parliament to have it or not? If the British Ministry is to have it, then Parliament will have it. You cannot place this power in the hands of Parliament without giving to Parliament a certain responsibility. If the veto rests with the House of Commons, it will be the duty of the House of Commons to look at the legislation, and the question may have again to be fought over in the British House of Commons.”

On behalf of the Government, Lord Spencer spoke again at Leeds (May 3), and especially addressed his remarks to the Land Purchase Bill, in defence of which Mr. Gladstone, according to his critics, had made his last feeble protest. There was, however, in Lord Spencer’s view of the duties of the Government, no suggestion of abandoning the landlords to their fate; but at the same time he dissented from his friends who argued that, the land difficulties once settled, all obstacles to the peaceful government of Ireland would disappear. The Nationalists, he maintained, would not allow the land question to be settled, and they had the ear and confidence of the Irish tenantry. “There is,”

proceeded, "another difficulty. I am confident of this, that no party in England would venture to propose a large land scheme for Ireland, a large scheme for purchasing out the landlords, unless there is an Irish authority in Dublin who will be—to use a familiar term—a buffer between the landlords and tenants and the English taxpayer. Gentlemen, I am convinced that the land question cannot be settled until Home Rule is passed for Ireland. This is a question on which we may trust the Irish Assembly, but it is a question on which the National party have committed themselves more than on any other. I think it is only fair to the landlords, and right for the Irish Assembly. We must remove this difficulty which has baffled us so long before we hand over the government to an Assembly which has already numerous and manifold difficulties. I believe it can be carried without its costing a single penny to the English taxpayer. Another difficulty has been raised, that of religious intolerance. I believe that we must give safeguards for the minority in that country; but if we come to the subject of religious intolerance, I do not believe that the Roman Catholic party will show intolerance to the Protestants in Ireland."

On the following night (May 4) Mr. Goschen challenged the Leeds Liberals to support the Unionists against the policy of the Government, and found as cordial support from his audience as Lord Spencer had from his hearers on the previous evening. Mr. Goschen commented on the only one point to be determined—whether there should be a separate domestic Legislature to settle Irish affairs. But the fact was that the establishment of a separate Government and a separate Legislature for Ireland in itself involved such a series of contradictions that no possible manipulation of the details could give any escape from the difficulties which are created. There was a series of inextricable dilemmas involved. If this were so, would it be honest to read the Bills a second time? He remarked on Mr. Gladstone's curious threat to the Irish landlords, contained in the remark that "the sands are running in the hour-glass," and interpreted it as coming to something like this: "Fools that you have not clutched at the gold which I have offered you, because you were too anxious for the position in which I was placing your country. Fools that you have not taken the ransom which at this moment I offer you. If you do not take it, then let the march 'through rapine to disintegration' take place. Here is your last chance take this, and desert your posts as patriots in Ireland.'"

Passing from Leeds to Preston (May 5), Mr. Goschen again attacked the Government policy with a vigour of which even his friends thought him little capable. After recapitulating with fresh arguments his previously expressed objections to the Bills, he entered a strong protest against Mr. Gladstone for calling in American opinion in support of his Irish policy, seeing *how strenuously* the Americans had resisted secession themselves



He described the Government measure as one tending to disintegration, and warmly maintained that not class interests alone, but a large body of both English and Scotch people objected to the Government scheme, which would not satisfy the Irish, but would only be regarded as a stepping-stone to still greater demands. He also spoke out frankly on the subject of coercion, and declared that the outcry which the mere mention of the word excited was only intelligible on the supposition that "there is not left sufficient power, resolution, and determination in the British people to enable them to deal with crime." No coercion, he said, was wanted in Ireland beyond that which ought to apply to the whole realm—so much as was necessary to secure the punishment of evildoers.

Although Mr. Goschen's searching criticism of the Government measure was thus being scattered broadcast over the country, its fruits were not immediately apparent. At the meeting of the General Committee of the London and Counties Liberal Union (May 4) the effect of the rumours diligently spread of a reconciliation between the Radical section was shown in the strong expressions of confidence in the Government passed by large majorities. This feeling was still more strongly brought out on the following day at the conference of the leaders of the National Federation of Liberal Associations, otherwise known as the Birmingham Caucus, when the party supporting Mr. Chamberlain sustained a complete defeat, and the direction of the Association was practically taken out of the hands of its original projectors. It was thought, and possibly with reason, that this revolt of the Caucus, and its unqualified decision to support the Government of Ireland Bill, would recall to their allegiance many Radicals who had expressed themselves more or less decisively to follow Mr. Chamberlain in his demand for important modifications of the Ministerial proposals. It was argued, moreover, that Mr. Gladstone's hands would be so strengthened by this expression of Liberal feeling that he could, without loss of prestige, concede the principle of Irish representation at Westminster—the only point on which, it was asserted, Mr. Chamberlain was making a stand. At this moment Mr. Chamberlain was credited with having at least fifty followers, and that practically in his hands lay the decision whether the Home Rule Bill should or should not be read a second time. A few days later, however, when it was discovered that the reconciliation between Mr. Gladstone and his quondam colleague had not followed the revolt of the Caucus, and that the latter had, moreover, given notice of his intention to move the rejection of the Land Purchase Bill, the Ministerialists made a very different estimate of Mr. Chamberlain's importance, asserting that he had not more than half a dozen adherents who would follow him on a critical division. All doubt, however, as to Mr. Chamberlain's intentions was set at rest by the publication of a letter (May 9<sup>th</sup>)

on the eve of the commencement of the debate on the second reading of the Irish Government Bill. In this letter the ex-President of the Local Government Board declared his readiness to vote for the second reading if the Prime Minister would meet the wishes of many of his followers for the maintenance of the Imperial Parliament as the supreme legislative authority for the United Kingdom. He was willing to leave all other points, including a separate treatment for Ulster, as details of the Bill to be settled in Committee; but he regarded "as the key of the position the maintenance of the full representation in the Imperial Parliament and of her full responsibility for all imperial affairs." No response from the Government side being forthcoming to this declaration, it was assumed that they intended, in spite of the appeals of many of their most cordial supporters, to press forward, unaltered and unmodified, the second reading of their Bill, and to obtain an immediate solution of the difficulties by which it was surrounded. But on this point also the public were to be disappointed, and for reasons which appeared paramount to the Government, and which were interpreted by the public as founded upon the activity of the Caucus, now wholly devoted to Mr. Gladstone. The debate, instead of being continued from day to day, was limited to Government nights, and thus protracted for nearly a month.

In moving the second reading of the Irish Government Bill (May 10) Mr. Gladstone began by denying that he had ever in any period of his life declared Home Rule in Ireland to be incompatible with imperial unity. In 1870 he had stated at Aberdeen the great satisfaction with which he heard the statements of the purposes of Home Rule; but he did not wish it to be supposed that he regarded the introduction of the principle as a slight matter—on the contrary, he had always held it to be one entailing the gravest responsibility, and he had always insisted that two conditions were indispensable—that it should be plainly demanded by a majority of the people, and that it should be a plan which would not be incompatible with the unity of the empire. The first condition, he maintained, was now fulfilled by the results of the general election, and the second was also satisfied by Mr. Parnell's declaration on the first night of the session that all he required was Irish autonomy—the power of managing Irish affairs in Ireland. Replying next to objections made to his policy, he denied that this was an experiment, and insisted that it was the only alternative left after a long succession of periods of coercion, remedial legislation, and judicious mixtures of the two; and, commenting on the taunt that he was departing from the policy of all the statesmen of the nineteenth century and was violating the ancient Whig tradition, he pointed out that former statesmen had not our experience of the working of the Union, and that Whig statesmen of a former *generation* would have done the same had they been placed in a

similar position. He dealt also at some length with the moral drawn in one direction or another from the case of Canada, and then proceeded to the practical question—What do the Government mean to do at this stage? Prefacing this part of his speech with a reminder that on the first reading he had stated that the principle of the Bill was to establish a legislative body in Ireland, with full control in dealing with legislative and administrative affairs in Ireland, and addressing himself mainly to those who were friendly to the principle of the Bill, he acknowledged the force of the objections brought against the disappearance of Irish members from the House of Commons, especially on the ground of the dissociation of representation from taxation. There was also a further sentiment of regret, which he recognised, that the Irish members should cease to manifest a common interest in imperial affairs, although he pointed out that there was more in the Bill to connect the Irish Parliament with foreign affairs than was supposed, and particularly he instanced the clause which contemplated the possibility that the Crown might recommend the Irish Parliament to make a grant of supply in the event of a war. It would of course be the duty, he said, of the Government to consider how far it would be possible to meet the desires of those who raised these objections. He would make as long steps in that direction as his duty would permit him, always on three conditions—first, that nothing should be done to break up the Parliamentary traditions of the House, or to interfere with its working; secondly, that the action of the Irish Legislature was not to be fettered against its will in any matters not essentially imperial, and that the scheme should not be converted into one which the Irish members would accept grudgingly; and, thirdly, that there was not to be a Committee discussion before the second reading. As to the question of taxation and representation, he thought that might be settled by taking a certain engagement from the Irish members as to the sum to be paid, and if any change were made in it the Irish members should be brought over here to consider it. He also canvassed certain proposals which had been made for constituting Commissions of British and Irish members for the consideration of financial and common imperial matters, assuring the House that it would be their duty to give them a fair consideration. As to the numbers of the Irish members when they were brought over here for special purposes, he did not think it necessary to make any change.

Finally, he declared that the purpose of the Bill was not mere expediency nor a desire for abstract improvement, but to apply a remedy which was imperatively necessary for the repression of social disorder; and while pointing out that the policy of the Opposition was coercion, and that of the Government autonomy, he insisted that Lord Hartington, on whom lay the responsibility in this matter, was *bound at once* to lay his alternative policy before

the House. Expressing his disbelief in the efficacy of an gradual reconstruction of the Irish Government, by which the country might be led by degrees to the management of its own affairs, Mr. Gladstone declared that the time and temper of Parliament would be lost in the discussion of loans which would either be repudiated by Ireland or received in a grudging temper and used as instruments for demanding more. "I believe," he concluded, "we have reached one of those crises in the history of nations where the path of boldness is the path, and the only path, of safety. At least we have come to a time when there is one thing we ought to know, and that is our minds. There is another thing which I hold to be essential—we ought not to take this great Irish question and cast the fate of Ireland into the lottery of politics. If we are proposing to drive Ireland down the cataract, point out to us the way of escape. Is it really to be supposed that the last declaration of my noble friend, which was the keeping alive of two or three clauses of the Crimes Act which we intended to keep in existence had we remained in office last year—is that really the policy for Ireland? To that no assent, no approval has been given from the important party opposite. Sir, Parliament is entitled to know at this time of day the alternatives that are open to its choice. You say that we offer the alternative of ruin. At any rate, in our view, it is of a very different character. But, even in your view, it is a definite proposal, which is our justification on its behalf, and therefore, is the only contribution which we can make to the solution of the question. Parliament is entitled to have before it the alternatives proposed—the alternatives of policy, not of plan, proposed by those who are taking steps which may in certain contingencies, with high probability, bring into their hands the supreme direction of affairs. The Tory party have announced their policy. Repression—the 26th of January. There is a policy to understand. But as regards my noble friend, I must say that I am totally ignorant with whom and what I am dealing, so far as policy is concerned. I hope that the notice he has given for to-night has been given with the intention of tracing out for us a palpable and visible road in the darkness, and that he will tell us on what principle it is that he proposes to make provision for the government of Ireland. Let us know these alternatives. The more they are examined the better I believe it will be for us all. It will become reasonably clear—I won't say to demonstration—that we have before us a great opportunity of putting an end to the controversy of 700 years—ay, and of knitting together, by bonds firmer and higher in their character than those which heretofore we have mainly used, the hearts and affections of this people and the noble fabric of the British Empire."

Lord Hartington at once rose to move the rejection of the Bill, prefacing his remarks by an expression of regret that he *should for the first time* have to follow his former leader in debate

Referring to Mr. Gladstone's statement that the question whether Home Rule was compatible with the unity of the empire was settled in his mind by a speech made on the first day of the session by Mr. Parnell, who said that all he wanted for Ireland was autonomy, Lord Hartington asked whether this great question which had long been perplexing the mind of Mr. Gladstone was to be solved by a single sentence spoken in debate, for a manifest and obvious purpose, by the leader of the National party, when that sentence was in direct contradiction to almost everything that he and his friends had hitherto said. Mr. Parnell and his friends had given repeated assurances that they were working and would work for and would be satisfied with nothing but complete separation. The answer which Mr. Gladstone had obtained to his doubts upon the subject of the compatibility of Home Rule in a united empire was, Lord Hartington contended, an unsatisfactory and an incomplete one. As to "experimenting in politics," he (Lord Hartington) should be rather inclined to define it as treating grave questions for grave causes but without grave and mature consideration. Whatever might be the consideration which Mr. Gladstone might have himself given to this policy and his measure, it was certain that the country and its representatives had had no sufficient opportunity of forming their judgment or giving their decision upon it. It was equally notorious that, with very few exceptions, his colleagues, up to the moment of their joining the present Government, had formed opinions and expressed opinions upon the question of Ireland certainly very little in harmony with the policy of the Prime Minister. Whether that policy were good or bad, it was a novel experiment; certainly never in the history of the world had the attempt been made to carry on the government of a country upon any such system as that which was now proposed for Ireland. As to the ridicule thrown by Mr. Gladstone on a policy of "judicious mixture," no Minister had ever admitted that the measures, either of repression or conciliation, were proposed on any such principle. Each measure was proposed because the Government thought it a measure of justice or of necessity. With regard to the Act of Union, Lord Hartington thought it probable that the carrying of that measure at that time was premature. But would the Premier himself say that he believed the Constitution of 1782 and the relation between Ireland and Great Britain which existed in 1800 could have been a permanent Constitution and relation? Lord Grey, who had been a great opponent of the Union, lived to be one of the strongest advocates of the Union and one of the strongest opponents of repeal. The agitation of Mr. O'Connell, although it did not attain to such large Parliamentary proportions, attained to at least as large national proportions as the present agitation had, and it was supported with as much enthusiasm by at least as large a proportion



of the people of Ireland. Undoubtedly that agitation had enlist upon its side a far larger and a more varied representation of classes in Ireland than the Home Rule movement of later years had done.

As to the part he was taking in assisting the Tories to defeat the Bill, Lord Hartington defended himself and his friends on the ground that they believed it to be a mischievous measure, which would not heal the long-standing feud between Great Britain and Ireland, that it did not satisfy the essential conditions laid down by Mr. Gladstone himself, and that it was no final settlement of the question. In reply to the taunt that he had not unfolded an alternative plan, he remarked that Mr. Gladstone had never done so under similar circumstances, and he insisted, moreover, that it was neither practicable nor possible to do so. He also repudiated Mr. Gladstone's contention that the House was not entitled to discuss the details of the plan at the present stage. They were, he said, the essence of the question, and whether the Bill was wise and politic or not could hardly be decided without their consideration. He failed to understand the proposed qualifications as to the continuance of Irish representation in the House of Commons, and, while ridiculing the joint commission suggested by Mr. Gladstone, which, he pointed out, showed more clearly than before that the Irish Parliament was to have a co-ordinate power with the English Parliament, he argued that any representation of Ireland in the House of Commons must necessarily make it impossible to exclude the consideration of Irish subjects. This question of the retention of the Irish members was an essential one, which must be clearly defined, and he doubted whether Mr. Gladstone's new and vague proposals would satisfy the requirements of Mr. Chamberlain. The Bill in fact, remained substantially the same. It limited for the first time the authority and omnipotence of Parliament, the cardinal principle of the maintenance of the Union was not secured, and no proper safeguard was provided for the loyal Protestant minority. Adverting for a moment to Mr. Gladstone's expressed willingness to extend a similar measure of autonomy to Scotland, Lord Hartington declared his conviction that the people of Scotland would not second it, and that it was extremely likely that the Irish in a short time would be found to be equally dissatisfied. He then went on to quote Mr. Gladstone's description in 1868 of the political party now said to be representative of the great majority of the Irish people, when "for the first time in the history of Christendom a small body of men had arisen who were not ashamed to preach in Ireland the doctrine of public plunder," and he asked whether Mr. Parnell had since repudiated this doctrine. He contrasted with the present proposals of the Prime Minister the following memorable words on the same occasion :—

"But if, when we have that short further experience to which

I have referred, it shall then appear that there is still to be fought a final conflict in Ireland between law on the one side and sheer lawlessness on the other; if the law, purged from defect and from any taint of injustice, is still to be repelled and refused, and the first conditions of political society are to be set at naught, then I say, gentlemen, without any hesitation, the resources of civilisation against its enemies are not yet exhausted."

"That was the policy," concluded Lord Hartington, "which my right hon. friend recommended then, and which I venture to recommend now. If this war—this final conflict between law on the one side and sheer lawlessness on the other—is to continue, that is the policy which I venture to recommend still, but for recommending which I and my friends are called the representatives of class. I see no reason why, simply because the party professing those principles has acquired greater strength, and possibly a greater claim to represent a larger number of the people of Ireland, we are to retire from that which has been called by my right hon. friend a conflict between law on the one side and sheer lawlessness on the other, and why we are to sacrifice, without any further struggle, the principles upon which, in the opinion of my right hon. friend at that time, the structure and the basis of society reposed."

The only other speech of interest during the evening was that of Mr. W. O'Brien, the editor of *United Ireland*, and one of the most advanced members of the Home Rule party. He spoke throughout with admirable temper, and the impression when he sat down was that he advanced the Home Rule cause more than any previous speaker of his party. He admitted that in days past violent speaking had been too freely resorted to, but he believed that Ireland would be reconciled by Home Rule, though Mr. O'Donovan would not. Irish members were not there to offer exaggerated assurances to the House, but he admitted that, though there were many points in the Bill which they would oppose strenuously, they regarded it on the whole as a reasonable and fair settlement which they could accept with the full intention of working it. But, if the struggle was to be prolonged, it would be seen that they were not tired of it, and whatever might be the fate of the Bill they would always remember Mr. Gladstone's share in it with gratitude. He further gave fair promises for the tolerance of the Irish Parliament towards the Protestants, and declared that the Ulster Protestants might make their influence predominant in that Assembly, if they knew how to use their advantages aright.

Mr. C. E. Lewis, the member for Londonderry, speaking on behalf of the Ulster Protestants, insisted on the material benefits which had resulted to Ireland from the Union, and in reply to the argument founded on the Nationalist majority, he pointed out that 98,000 illiterate voters had been polled at the

last election, and that these consequently had not voted under the protection of the ballot.

In resuming the debate on the Irish Bill (May 18), Sir Henry James said he ever acknowledged the obligation of party ties, and especially he entertained some sentiment, call it loyalty or anything else, which made him feel that the man who —

“ Spared to lift his hand against the king  
Who made him knight ”

acted with no very remarkable degree of chivalry. But he must accept the Premier's invitation to grapple with the principles of this measure. Much argument had been directed to the wrongs endured by Ireland in past times. Ireland had indeed been misgoverned; but past generations could not be recompensed for their wrongs, and there was now the firmest desire to do justice towards Ireland. It was true that the Union had been obtained by corruption; but the arguments that were good for preventing an improvident marriage were not equally sound years after for undoing it. Assuming for the purposes of this debate that there was reason for introducing some such measure, Sir Henry only dealt with the Bill itself. Five main conditions, which might be reduced to three, had been attached to the carrying out of any measure giving autonomy to Ireland. The Premier had stated that, first, the unity of the empire should be preserved; secondly, that the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament should be maintained; further, that provision should be made for social order and also for the protection of the rights of property and for the protection of the minority; and, lastly, that the measure so carried into effect should be a final settlement. Now this measure would not fulfil one of these conditions.

“Unity by virtue of one Crown being paramount over the three kingdoms is,” he argued, “substantially no unity. There was no unity between Hanover and England when the Crown of the two kingdoms was on one head. The real unity of a kingdom must depend upon the unity of its laws. I do not mean by that that there must be an identity of laws. There was the junction of the Crown before the Act of Union, but the union of the empire was effected by the junction of the two Parliaments. There was no United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland before the Act of Union. That Act was the only bond which made these kingdoms united kingdoms. What does the supremacy of Parliament mean? It means the power of making laws for the whole dominions of the Crown. I now ask whether it is the intention of the Government that, if this Bill passes into law, the Parliament, which would not be the Imperial Parliament which now exists, but a British Parliament, will have the power of making laws for Ireland? I can come to no other conclusion than that it is the intention of the Government to allow Ireland *to legislate* for her own affairs alone. If the British Parliament,

which would cease to be an Imperial Parliament, is to have a superior power over the Irish Parliament, and can repeal the laws made by the Irish Parliament, where will be the value of this Bill to Irish members? If the Irish members are taken away, the Imperial Parliament will cease to exist. It would be useful to know what would be the effect upon the Irish members if the Government were to state that it is their intention to allow them to make such laws as they may think right, but that the power will be reserved to the British Parliament to repeal those laws if they think fit. The result would be, of course, that there would be no one in the British Parliament to defend the views of the Irish electors. That, therefore, is a condition to which the Irish members will never submit. By the silence of those who can correct me if I am wrong, I presume that it is the intention of the Government that this supremacy of the British over the Irish Parliament shall not exist, and that the Irish Parliament shall have free power to govern their country in relation to their own affairs. That being so, Ireland will be the only portion of her Majesty's dominions over which the British Parliament will have no control. . . . The Irish members say they are willing to leave this Parliament. They are joint tenants of the Chamber at this moment, and are willing to give up their estate in this House. They go away on the terms that they shall legislate for themselves in Ireland, and that if ever we should wish to take that power away from them we should recall them here. Therefore we shall not have the power to alter the constitution of our Chamber, so far as it is affected by this Bill, without calling these Irish members back."

Sir Henry James then went on to argue that under the Bill no proper provision was made for the protection of the minority in Ireland, which deserved especial protection from the English Parliament, by which it had been planted in Ulster. He showed the flimsiness of the paper guarantees which at the end of three years would have placed the Second Order (or Upper Chamber), the judges, and constabulary under the control of the majority, and even the army, left for the purposes of protection, would, except in case of rebellion, always act by the advice of the Executive representing the majority. In conclusion, he entreated the House to ascertain before the Bill left the House where substantial safeguards could be found for the loyalists of Ulster. "We cannot forget that we have been their friends, and they have been our friends; and we ought to protect them now."

In reply to this searching criticism of the principle underlying the Bill, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, on behalf of the Government, started by saying that in framing their measure the Cabinet had not proceeded on the expectation that the Irish people would exhibit none of the virtues and all the vices of the human race. If, unfortunately, there existed in that country hostility and jealousy between different classes and creeds, that

was due not to the Irish people, but to the system under which they had been governed. Little or nothing had been said by the opponents of the Bill against its main object and principle. But there never was, he argued, a case in which the transcendent importance of the main object of a Bill was so completely absorbed by the details. It was not too much to say that the fact that the responsible Government of the Queen had proposed to Parliament the establishment of a statutory Parliament in Ireland, with full control of Irish affairs, was the gravest and most startling event in the political life of any man among them. But could it have been imagined that when it came to be proposed it would be met, not on the ground that it was not the right thing to do, but because it was done under wrong conditions and in a wrong way?

Holding that the cardinal principle of the Bill was the real point at issue, and that, subject to the establishment of a local body which should have legislative as well as administrative functions, and on which the Irish Executive could rest, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman vaguely hinted that there were modifications in their scheme to which the Government were prepared to consent. He did not see how Mr. Gladstone's declaration that the Parliamentary traditions of the House of Commons should not be broken up was reconcilable with the demand that all Irish members should obtain full representation; but he thought that, by fixing the contribution from Ireland at a stereotyped figure, the difficulties about taxation and representation not going hand in hand might be got over. He therefore suggested, amid derisive cheers from the Opposition, the contribution having been fixed by the House as then constituted, that before any notice was made to create or increase a tax the Irish members should be summoned—restored to their full position in the House. Mr. Boyd-Kinnear made a good point against those who supported the Bill as a first step towards a federal empire. In every system of federation, he argued, equality between the federated States was an essential condition. Austria and Hungary, though differing in population and wealth, are represented in the Delegations by an exactly equal number of deputies and the smallest and the largest States of the American Union alike return two members to the United States Senate. If England, Scotland, and Ireland were to become a Federal instead of a United Kingdom, they should be equally represented at Westminster. Lord George Hamilton, on behalf of the front Opposition Bench, denounced the Bill as a step in the direction of annihilating the Imperial Parliament, and an attempt to legalise intimidation. He repeated that the Irish policy of Mr. Gladstone had always ended in failure, and, having recalled the Conservative objection to the manner in which the Irish representation was increased last year, he showed by statistics that the Unionists represented at least a third of the voting population of Ireland, and an absolute majority of the educated and thrifty classes.



The Bill was not a mere transfer of administration, but a complete revolution ; it would act with the greatest injustice to the propertied classes, and must lead to a collision between the two Parliaments. As to Ulster, there was no disorder there—this Bill was not wanted there—and he denied the moral competence of Parliament to compel the loyalists either to submit to the despotism of a traitorous association or seek a refuge from oppression by going out into the open. In conclusion, he warned the House against the policy of abandonment which the late Parliament had found so mischievous and fatal in South Africa and the Soudan.

Following the example set on the first night, the views of the Parnellites were explained by a prominent member among their body, Mr. Dillon, who denied the allegation so often made in the course of the debate, that this was not the Bill which the Irish people wanted, and that they would only take it as a means of getting more. With the modifications suggested by Mr. Parnell, he said the Irish members were ready to accept the Bill as a settlement, and would pledge themselves to work it honestly. As to the retention of the Irish representatives at Westminster, for the present at least the Irish members did not desire it, though they would go a long way to prevent the wreck of the Bill. Until they had lifted their own country from its present distracted position they did not desire to attend in the Supreme Parliament, though at some future period they might claim to do so. Defending the Irish Parliament, he maintained that if it had been left to itself it would have emancipated the Catholics before the Union, and he went at length into the commercial statistics to prove that the prosperity of Ireland had been checked and destroyed by the Union. In like manner the dissentient Liberals found an effective spokesman in Mr. Leatham, who, looking at the question from an English as well as from an Irish point of view, complained that the Liberal party had not been consulted before so momentous a question had been brought forward. In the course of a bitter criticism of the Bill, he described it as the most formidable instrument that could have been devised for the disintegration of the Liberal party, and an affront to Liberal principles. But it was outside the House that the fate was being decided, whilst an aimless debate was allowed to drag on for no other apparent reason than to give the party managers the opportunity of marshalling their forces, or of inventing reasons for recalling Liberal seceders to their allegiance. So long as it seemed that the Whigs who followed Lord Hartington were alone likely to stand aloof, or to vote in opposition to the bulk of their party, little fear as to the result was felt by the Ministerialists. They affected to believe that Mr. Chamberlain and his friends would either accept some "paper compromise," or at the last moment would hesitate to break up the *Liberal party*.

was due not to the Irish people, but to the system under which they had been governed. Little or nothing had been said by the opponents of the Bill against its main object and principle. But there never was, he argued, a case in which the transcendent importance of the main object of a Bill was so completely absorbed by the details. It was not too much to say that the fact that the responsible Government of the Queen had proposed to Parliament the establishment of a statutory Parliament in Ireland, with full control of Irish affairs, was the gravest and most startling event in the political life of any man among them. But could it have been imagined that when it came to be proposed it would be met, not on the ground that it was not the right thing to do, but because it was done under wrong conditions and in a wrong way?

Holding that the cardinal principle of the Bill was the real point at issue, and that, subject to the establishment of a local body which should have legislative as well as administrative functions, and on which the Irish Executive could rest, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman vaguely hinted that there were modifications in their scheme to which the Government were prepared to consent. He did not see how Mr. Gladstone's declaration that the Parliamentary traditions of the House of Commons should not be broken up was reconcilable with the demand that all Irish members should obtain full representation; but he thought that, by fixing the contribution from Ireland at a stereotyped figure, the difficulties about taxation and representation not going hand in hand might be got over. He therefore suggested, amid derisive cheers from the Opposition, the contribution having been fixed by the House as then constituted, that before any notice was made to create or increase a tax the Irish members should be summoned—restored to their full position in the House. Mr. Boyd-Kinnear made a good point against those who supported the Bill as a first step towards a federal empire. In every system of federation, he argued, equality between the federated States was an essential condition. Austria and Hungary, though differing in population and wealth, are represented in the Delegations by an exactly equal number of deputies, and the smallest and the largest States of the American Union alike return two members to the United States Senate. If England, Scotland, and Ireland were to become a Federal instead of a United Kingdom, they should be equally represented at Westminster. Lord George Hamilton, on behalf of the front Opposition Bench, denounced the Bill as a step in the direction of annihilating the Imperial Parliament, and an attempt to legalise intimidation. He repeated that the Irish policy of Mr. Gladstone had always ended in failure, and, having recalled the Conservative objection to the manner in which the Irish representation was increased last year, he showed by statistics that the Unionists *represented at least a third of the voting population of Ireland, and an absolute majority of the educated and thrifty classes.*

The Bill was not a mere transfer of administration, but a complete revolution; it would act with the greatest injustice to the propertied classes, and must lead to a collision between the two Parliaments. As to Ulster, there was no disorder there—this Bill was not wanted there—and he denied the moral competence of Parliament to compel the loyalists either to submit to the despotism of a traitorous association or seek a refuge from oppression by going out into the open. In conclusion, he warned the House against the policy of abandonment which the late Parliament had found so mischievous and fatal in South Africa and the Soudan.

Following the example set on the first night, the views of the Parnellites were explained by a prominent member among their body, Mr. Dillon, who denied the allegation so often made in the course of the debate, that this was not the Bill which the Irish people wanted, and that they would only take it as a means of getting more. With the modifications suggested by Mr. Parnell, he said the Irish members were ready to accept the Bill as a settlement, and would pledge themselves to work it honestly. As to the retention of the Irish representatives at Westminster, for the present at least the Irish members did not desire it, though they would go a long way to prevent the wreck of the Bill. Until they had lifted their own country from its present distracted position they did not desire to attend in the Supreme Parliament, though at some future period they might claim to do so. Defending the Irish Parliament, he maintained that if it had been left to itself it would have emancipated the Catholics before the Union, and he went at length into the commercial statistics to prove that the prosperity of Ireland had been checked and destroyed by the Union. In like manner the dissentient Liberals found an effective spokesman in Mr. Leatham, who, looking at the question from an English as well as from an Irish point of view, complained that the Liberal party had not been consulted before so momentous a question had been brought forward. In the course of a bitter criticism of the Bill, he described it as the most formidable instrument that could have been devised for the disintegration of the Liberal party, and an affront to Liberal principles. But it was outside the House that the fate was being decided, whilst an aimless debate was allowed to drag on for no other apparent reason than to give the party managers the opportunity of marshalling their forces, or of inventing reasons for recalling Liberal seceders to their allegiance. So long as it seemed that the Whigs who followed Lord Hartington were alone likely to stand aloof, or to vote in opposition to the bulk of their party, little fear as to the result was felt by the Ministerialists. They affected to believe that Mr. Chamberlain and his friends would either accept some "paper compromise," or at the last moment would hesitate to break up the Liberal party.

A meeting held at Devonshire House (May 14) revealed fact that the Irish policy of the Government was repudiated nearly one-third of the Liberal party in the House of Commons. The meeting was summoned by Lord Hartington, and among those who responded to his invitation were Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Trevelyan, Sir Henry James, Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Leatham, Mr. Caine, and about sixty others. Lord Hartington first addressed the meeting, and explained at some length the position which he had taken up. He was unable to support the second reading of the Bill, and he regarded the modifications which the Government had suggested as increasing rather than diminishing the objections which he entertained to the scheme. These objections were so strong that he could not accept the proposal which had been rumoured abroad that the Government wished to regard the vote on the second reading as a vote on an abstract resolution, and that in the event of the second reading being carried they would withdraw the Bill, with the intention of bringing it forward at an autumn session. He could not consent to vote for the second reading on that understanding, because the effect would be to hang the question for the summer and autumn months, and the tension which existed, especially in Ulster, would be so great that serious and even disastrous results might ensue. If the matter had been originally brought forward as an abstract resolution, he could not now say what line the Liberal party as a whole would have been inclined to adopt; but the scheme, as developed by the Bills, showed what the resolution would really have meant, and such a resolution, as embodied in those Bills, he could not support. It was a matter of deep regret to him to be under the necessity of severing himself from those with whom he had so long acted, but in this case he was compelled in the interests of the country to follow the path which was marked out for him by a sense of duty.

Mr. Rylands, Sir Hussey Vivian, Mr. Wiggin, and Mr. Finlay subsequently addressed the meeting, thanking Lord Hartington for the courageous and straightforward course which he had adopted, concurring with the views which he had expressed, and specially insisting upon the impracticability of the proposal that the second reading of the Bill should be accepted simply as a declaration in favour of the principle of Home Rule.

Mr. Mitchell Henry, as a former member of the party which had followed Mr. Butt, pointed out the entire change of circumstances which had taken place in Ireland since Mr. Butt's death. There was no such union of feeling at the present time between Catholics and Protestants as happily existed when Mr. Butt was leader of the Home Rule party.

After a few short speeches, Mr. Chamberlain rose, and replied that the hope expressed that the leaders of the Liberal party should agree upon some course of action was premature.

what they had to do was to consider how best they could meet the dangers now threatened. He, however, assured the meeting that the leaders of the Liberal opposition to the Home Rule and Land Purchase Bills were practically united as to the policy which should guide their action. He exposed the inadequacy and futility of the concessions offered by the Government, and concurred with Lord Hartington in the opinion that it was quite impossible to assent to a proposal to accept the second reading of the Bill as a vote upon an abstract resolution in favour of autonomy. He added that, even if Mr. Gladstone made all the concessions demanded, they would have now to consider the spirit in which those concessions were made.

A separate meeting of Mr. Chamberlain's adherents was attended by a score of members who took no part in the Devonshire House gathering, and these, in addition to certain declared or assumed opponents of the Bills, raised the number of seceders, according to different estimates, from 104 to 122, out of a total of 333 Liberals and 86 Parnellites. If these calculations were only partially borne out by the division when it came to be taken, the displacement of 84 Liberal votes would suffice to place the Government in a minority.

The prospects thus held out to the Conservatives of a probable speedy return to power may have tempted Lord Salisbury, in his address at the St. James's Hall (May 15), to have been less cautious than he otherwise would have been in alluding to the needs of Ireland. Speaking to the delegates of the National Union of Conservative Associations, he assured them that his policy was the traditional policy of the Tory party; that he was friendly to local self-government, but that Home Rule meant separation; and that, whatever the present disposition of Irish members, their successors would repudiate the "tribute." He maintained that Ireland was not a nation, but two nations; held that there were races, like the Hottentots and even the Hindoos, who were incapable of self-government; and refused to place confidence in a people who had "acquired the habit of using knives and slugs." He doubted whether the strong organisation of the Catholic Church in Ireland had not fallen into bad hands, denounced the section of the Irish people which fought out political questions by aid of terrorism, and propounded his own alternative policy. "My alternative policy is that Parliament should enable the Government of England to govern Ireland. Apply that recipe honestly, consistently, and resolutely for twenty years, and at the end of that time you will find that Ireland will be fit to accept any gifts in the way of local government or repeal of coercion laws that you may wish to give her. What she wants is government—government that does not flinch, that does not vary; government that she cannot hope to beat down by agitations at Westminster; government that does not alter in its resolutions or its temperature to the



party changes which take place at Westminster." He would also, he said, rather employ British wealth in aiding the emigration of a million Irishmen than in buying out landlords, and concluded by telling his hearers that while he welcomed Liberal allies with great willingness, and was ready to assist them so far as the agreement of their opinions would allow, the brunt of the battle must fall upon the Tory party, though they should not seek to snatch a party advantage from it.

Lord Salisbury's opponents at once fastened upon a few of these phrases, and pretended that he had likened the Irish to Hottentots, and that the Conservative party had no solution of the Irish difficulty to offer, beyond twenty years' coercion and the forced expatriation of a million Irish families. So loud was the outcry raised in many quarters that a few days later Lord Salisbury took occasion of the general meeting of the Primrose League (May 19) to deny that he had recommended coercion or had advocated expatriation. Crime, he declared, must be put down, but the duty of the Government was not only to repress crime but to ameliorate the condition of the people. Moreover, he had not even recommended emigration but had merely observed that if a large sum of money were to be raised and spent it would be better expended on emigration than on buying out the landlords.

On the resumption of the debate (May 17), which was thenceforward continued from night to night, Sir R. Cross commenced with a complaint as to the inadequate protection offered to the Irish loyalists, and soon had a chance of crossing swords with the Secretary of War. He referred to the speech delivered by Mr. Campbell-Bannerman before he had "found salvation," and when he held the view that Home Rule ought not to be given to Ireland, and that Irishmen ought to be content with some mild measure of local government. Mr. Campbell-Bannerman at once rose to protest, though he confessed that the quotation from his speech of the winter was accurate; but he added, amid the laughter of the House, that it was "stronger than he would now like to indorse," and that it was "an indiscreet expression," out of harmony with the "gist and tone" of the rest of his speech. In reply, Sir R. Cross argued, in terms which Mr. Campbell-Bannerman made no further effort to deny, that at all events the passage appeared to express the opinion of the right honourable gentleman at a time when his views had not been "corrupted and warped by the pressure of some of his colleagues." A little later, Sir Richard Cross charged Mr. Gladstone with having said it was not his duty "at present" to advocate the disturbance of the Union, and was drawing the natural inference that the time might soon arrive when the Prime Minister might find it convenient to advocate repeal pure and simple. Mr. Gladstone having questioned the accuracy of the quotation, it was produced and read; and Mr. Gladstone, making

no further remark, rose from the Treasury bench and left the House. Sir Richard Cross went on to argue that the Irish members must be retained in Westminster if the supremacy and sovereignty of Parliament were to be retained ; and, by way of a policy for Ireland, advocated the "firm and generous administration of the law"—a plea which the Parnellites, through the mouth of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, met by a cry of "Coercion." The resolutions in favour of the Bill by the caucuses were dismissed as things which "might tickle the vanity of the Prime Minister," but which were not to control the decision of Parliament. In the same way, Sir Richard declined to heed the voice of the Irish in America, for Parliament was "not accustomed to alter laws because outrages would follow"; and he declared in a concluding sentence that, "though this supreme Parliament knows how to be just and generous, there is one thing that it cannot afford to do, and that is—to be afraid."

Mr. Stansfeld, the latest Cabinet recruit, who followed, owned that he had the "weakness" of believing the Irish members when they professed to accept the Bill of the Government as a final settlement of the question ; and while confessing that the proposals he advocated would constitute a revolution, he claimed that it was "peaceful." He then turned to Lord Salisbury's speech at St. James's Hall. It was, he said, a speech "excelling in calculated recklessness—the wildest speech ever uttered by Nationalist or Orangeman." It was "an insult to the Irish people," because it denied that they were a nation. It placed them "in the same category as Hottentots and Orientals." It expressed a disbelief of "Irish members on their oath," because Lord Salisbury had said that they would "swear anything." But Mr. Stansfeld anticipated that this speech would confer an increased benefit on the Liberal party, for it would "arouse a spirit of indignation, determination, and union in the Liberal ranks," by proving that the Tory party had nothing to recommend but "twenty years of coercion, with the emigration of a million of her depleted population." In reply to the masterly constitutional argument of Sir Henry James, Mr. Stansfeld argued that the supremacy of Parliament would not be destroyed, and that the Bill, if passed, could be repealed next year, and he contended that the sovereignty of Parliament was not upset, but only "suspended." The Bill, he maintained, certainly did not mean ultimate separation ; that was an idea in which no sane Irishman indulged, which no Englishman would accept unless Ireland was "loosed from her moorings and towed a thousand miles away into the broad Atlantic."

The most important speech of the evening on behalf of the Government was that delivered by the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bryce, who prefaced his remarks by the announcement that there would be no indisposition on the part of the Government to test the opinion of the constituencies on the

Irish question—an announcement which was received with loud cheers by the Irish Home Rulers. Mr. Bryce then set himself to reply to the constitutional difficulties put forward by Sir Henry James. The unity of the empire, he contended, did not depend on the unity of the Legislature; and, as to the sovereignty of Parliament, he asserted that the Imperial Parliament would still be able to legislate for Ireland, maintaining that the Imperial Parliament could not divest itself of the strictly *legal* right to repeal any Irish statute passed in the Dublin Assembly. Mr. Bryce asserted that if this Bill passed, Parliament would have bound itself by contract, which it would be morally disgraceful to break, not to use that right except in the way appointed—namely, after resummoning the Irish members, and re-arguing the whole case with them—so long as the Dublin Parliament observed honestly the terms of the “treaty” between the two nations. If, however, the Irish Parliament did not observe fairly their side of the contract, it would, he maintained, be morally justifiable, as well as strictly legal, for Parliament to veto what the Irish Parliament might do, and this without resummoning the Irish members.

Mr. Bryce illustrated the advantages which he expected from the proposed measure by the case of Iceland, which for thirty years had sustained a struggle against the power of the Danish monarchy. In 1874 legislative independence was conceded and, ever since 1874, Mr. Bryce declared that Iceland and Denmark had been perfectly friendly. [This proved to be a somewhat unfortunate assertion, as a few weeks later the mail brought news of an imminent disagreement between the Iceland Legislature and the Danish Government.] He contrasted the friendly relations of Finland—possessing autonomy—to Russia with the hostile relations of Poland, which had none, and he suggested that if Schleswig and Holstein had been granted autonomy by Denmark they would never have been annexed by Germany. He concluded a powerful speech by saying that not only was the proposed Bill a solution which involved the choice of the least evil in a difficult case, but was one which was good in itself, the British Parliament being too ignorant of Ireland to legislate well for that country. Remonstrating with the Radical opponents of the Bill, he said that the Government would consider the retention of the Irish members for imperial purposes as an open question and warned them that by rejecting the second reading they would be playing the game of their enemies.

From this point, and during the many succeeding nights devoted to the discussion of the Bill, it was obvious that members were addressing their constituents, in view of an approaching dissolution, rather than hoping to convince their opponents in the House. Within its precincts, the interest in the debate was kept alive chiefly by personalities, not by any fresh arguments in favour or in condemnation of the measure. Mr. Shaw-Lefevre

for instance, who had just been returned by Mr. W. E. Forster's constituency at Bradford, seemed chiefly anxious to accentuate the fact that he differed in every point from his lamented predecessor. The main purpose of his speech (May 18) was to show how disastrously the Union had worked, and how autonomy of itself would cure all sectional jealousies. He renewed Mr. Stansfeld's attack on Lord Salisbury's recent speech, declaring, despite the vigorous protests of the Conservatives, that it laid down a policy of twenty years of coercion for Ireland; and though he claimed to have been a consistent Home Ruler himself for the last four years—ever since he visited Ireland and found how badly the country was administered—he excused the inconsistency of many of his friends by quoting Pitt's remark that "the man must be a slave to vanity who is not inconsistent in his opinions for ten years," substituting in the present case "weeks" for "years." He urged, moreover, that the Union with Ireland was not a real union, that it had delayed instead of expediting remedial legislation, and had had the most unfortunate effect upon the relations of classes, and in exasperating the Irish people. Indeed, it had turned out so badly that he could not refrain from quoting, but he "did not indorse," the prophecy of Grattan when the Union was accomplished, that "though England had destroyed the autonomy of Ireland, Ireland would be revenged, and would send at no distant day a hundred of her worst rebels to invade the British Parliament"—a quotation which was received with approval by the Home Rulers. After a lengthy survey of the relations between the two kingdoms, from the beginning of the century, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre came to more recent events. He went on to explain that Mr. Chamberlain submitted to the Cabinet of the last Liberal Administration a plan for an Irish National Council which should contain, like Mr. Gladstone's scheme, two "orders"—one elected by the owners of property, and the other by the ratepayers. Upon this Mr. Chamberlain rose to offer, with some warmth, a protest. "The right hon. gentleman," he said, "is now speaking of matters which came within the knowledge of the Cabinet, but which——" The sentence, however, was not permitted to have an end for the moment, for Mr. Healy shouted across the floor, in great excitement, "Like yourself!" Mr. Chamberlain, with undisturbed composure, remodelled his sentence—"but which, unlike myself, the right hon. gentleman has not received the authority of her Majesty to discuss." Mr. Chamberlain went on to deny that he was the author of the proposal described by Mr. Lefevre—"it was suggested," he said, "by somebody else." Mr. Lefevre went on to declare that the proposal was communicated to him, not in the Cabinet, but outside, by Mr. Chamberlain himself. But Mr. Chamberlain again rose to repudiate emphatically the idea that he had "ever proposed a double representation of property and persons"; and Mr. Lefevre thereupon withdrew.

statement unreservedly, bringing his speech soon afterwards to a somewhat abrupt conclusion.

The remainder of the evening's debate was occupied by speeches by Mr. Chaplin on behalf of the Conservatives, Mr. T. D. Sullivan on behalf of the Irish Nationalists, and Mr. Labouchere on behalf of those who still wished, and perhaps hoped, to bring back Mr. Chamberlain to the side of the Government. Simultaneously, a meeting was being held at Bradford in support of the Unionist Liberals, and Lord Hartington's speech was received with an enthusiasm which proved that Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's views were not shared by all the Liberals or Radicals of the borough for which he sat. After referring in sympathetic terms to the great national loss which had been sustained in the death of Mr. Forster, Lord Hartington went on to insist that to pass the second reading of the Home Rule Bill as if it were a mere assent to an abstract resolution pledging the House to some scheme of Irish autonomy, would be a far greater violation of the Prime Minister's wise canon against assenting to abstract resolutions than had ever been proposed by private members who advocated such abstract resolutions. A Government which had had access to the best legal and official advice, and had taken advantage of that advice, and had yet not been able to produce a scheme of which any considerable number of its supporters approved even in its general outline, had gone a long way towards showing the immense difficulties in carrying out such an abstract resolution, and had strengthened the case of those who believed them to be insuperable. Lord Hartington then drew in vigorous terms a hasty sketch of the drift of Mr. Gladstone's scheme. The statutory Legislature in Dublin could, if it pleased, make a new criminal code; could abolish trial by jury, and the Habeas Corpus Act; could alter all the laws protecting the liberty of the subject, and punishing the molestation of that liberty; could alter the law of contract; could extend the Land Act to house property; and, whenever it did any of these things, our Parliament could not practically, under the "treaty" as proposed between Ireland and England, interfere with it. The new Legislature could tax certain manufactures, and put a bounty on others; it could establish public works on a great scale, and levy the funds for them as it chose; and whatever it did could not be undone without summoning the Irish members to propose a repeal of the fundamental law establishing the Irish Parliament. Lord Hartington went on to challenge the right of Irish members, under the conditions of their election, to agree to the proposed Land Act, as well as the right of English members to agree, on their side, to sign this treaty. Turning to the practical working of the Bill, if ever it became law, he proceeded:—

"Mr. Gladstone himself has said that the idea of separation is absurd. He has said that England can draw Ireland after *her as easily as a great ship-of-war can draw a toy-boat in her*



wake. But, we have not found it so easy to bring to bear the vastly superior power of England upon Ireland in order to govern her up till now ; and are we certain that in future, if the question of absolute separation is raised, we shall find it any easier to bring to bear our superior power upon Ireland ? How would it be raised ? It would be raised in the form, in the first place, of a demand for the suspension of the English tribute, of the payments to the English Exchequer. It would be raised, probably, if England happens to be at war with a powerful State, in the form of a declaration of independence. It would be raised in the form of a refusal of the Irish to pay the tribute or to pay any attention to any of the restrictions imposed upon the Irish Government by this Act. And what would be our remedy ? I shall be told that we could reconquer Ireland ; that Ireland would have no armed force which could oppose our armed force. It may be that Ireland would have some armed force by that time ; but, granting that it was our work to reconquer Ireland if necessary, what happens after that ? After the reconquest of Ireland, we are confronted with the task of the government of Ireland just as much as we are confronted with it now. And under what conditions should we have to undertake then the government of Ireland ? The conditions of the government of Ireland are difficult enough now : would they be easier then ? We have now, at all events, able, faithful, devoted, and loyal civil servants. We have civil servants who do their duty to us, and who believe that they are doing their duty to their own country in doing it. We have upright, learned, able judges and magistrates administering the law in Ireland, and believing that they are administering a just law. We have at our command the Royal Irish Constabulary, on whose fidelity and efficiency no one has ever cast a shadow of a doubt. But what will be the case in our task of the government of Ireland after this reconquest which we are told is so easy ? Our civil servants and our judges will be replaced by civil servants and by judges who will not be our friends, but will be our enemies, who will not respect our law, but will have been taught to despise and condemn it. We shall not have the services of the Irish constabulary to rely upon. We shall have a police which has been trained in the hatred and the detestation of everything that is English, and who will be not the arm by which the law will be enforced, but probably the nucleus of opposition to law. Is not all this possible, at all events, and is it not possible that when further troubles with Ireland arise, all these contingencies will occur to the minds of the statesmen and politicians of that time ? Is it not likely that fainting and weak counsels will prevail then, as I fear they are prevailing now ? Is it not likely that a party will be found who will say, 'Well, after all, what are we giving the Irish ? Was it worth while to give them this *half-autonomy* ? Will it not be better to

complete our beneficent work? Would it not be better to give them complete independence now that we have given them sort of maimed independence? Would it not be better,' would be asked, 'to have a friendly independent nation at our gates than a hostile dependency?' Would not counsels of this kind in all probability prevail—at all events, prevail sufficient to paralyse our arm and unnerve our judgment? And, looking this contingency in the face, is it possible to say that the chance of actual, complete, and final separation is altogether a fantastical dream, and is not brought appreciably nearer to us by the measure we have now under consideration?"

The speech was regarded on all sides as practically deciding the fate of the Irish Bills of the Government. Lord Hartington had taken up a position from which it was impossible to recede even should Mr. Gladstone follow the advice given him on some sides to abandon both his measures, and to take a vote on an abstract resolution in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. The uncompromising attitude of the Whigs having then been fully realised, the efforts of the Ministerialists to attract or coerce the support of the Radicals who adhered to Mr. Chamberlain became more marked. Of these there were about thirty; and up to that time they had supported their leader in expressing a readiness to reunite themselves to the bulk of their party, if the Bills before the House were formally withdrawn, and a definite promise that they would be reintroduced with very considerable modifications.

The course of the debate on the government of Ireland was of necessity interrupted for one night (May 20) in order to obtain the second reading of the Arms (Ireland) Bill, which was intended to continue for two years the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act 1881, which otherwise would have expired at the close of the month. The chief interest attaching to the measure arose from the previous declarations of the Chief Secretary as to the especial need of some such measure in the North of Ulster from the attitude which the Nationalist party would assume towards this remnant of coercion; and, incidentally, from Mr. Gladstone's unexpected intervention in the debate. Mr. John Morley, in moving the second reading, briefly explained that the provisions of the Act of 1881 which he proposed to continue were limited to imposing restrictions on the sale, carrying, and importation of arms. In districts proclaimed by the Lord-Lieutenant no person would be allowed to have arms without a licence, the Lord-Lieutenant would be empowered to issue warrants to search for arms, and importation of arms would be prohibited except at specified ports. As to the justification for the Bill in the present state of the country, although there was undoubtedly a most gratifying decrease in the number of outrages, there was unquestionably a state of expectancy and a political tension which *could not be overlooked*, and the object of renewing the Act was

to prevent people carrying arms at processions, meetings, fairs, and other gatherings.

Mr. Parnell followed the Chief Secretary at once, and explained that whilst he had no desire to embarrass his friends, it was impossible for him to close his eyes to the fact that up to that time the Act had been made use of to disarm and annoy the Nationalist party. He demanded therefore that these powers of the law, if obtained, should be employed to restrain the Orangemen, who, he feared, would be ready to commit murder and outrage at the next general election. In view of the incitements of Mr. Chamberlain, Lord R. Churchill, and others, he could not deny that the hands of the Government required strengthening. Lord R. Churchill, who had been accused of inciting to assassination and outrage, and whose assertion that Ulster would fight, and Ulster would be right, had been censured as bordering on treason, defended himself in a spirited and indignant speech. If, he said, he were guilty of the acts imputed to him by Mr. Parnell, or even if he came under the condemnation he supposed to have been passed upon him by Sir Henry James—though the latter denied that he intended any personal allusion—he was not deserving of a seat in the House of Commons, but ought to stand before a court of justice. His statement that if the Ulster loyalists were deprived by the Imperial Parliament of the protection they enjoyed as subjects of the Queen, and if they were placed, in spite of their protests, under the rule of another Assembly, consequences would follow which would involve a resort to forcible resistance, was challenged by Sir Henry James, but Lord Randolph Churchill was able to cite the authority of Lord Althorp, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Morley, and even the Prime Minister himself in support of the contention that, in such circumstances, even civil war might be justified morally, if not technically.

The extraordinary feature in the debate, however, was Mr. Gladstone's intervention. He was not present during Lord Randolph Churchill's speech, but this did not prevent him from attacking its doctrine, or rather that of the Belfast address, on which, as Mr. Plunket pointed out, it was entirely out of order to comment. The substance of the Prime Minister's attack was that Lord Randolph Churchill, as a late Minister of the Crown, as a representative of the law, and as a member of the Privy Council, had maintained that resistance to constituted authority could, in any circumstances, be justified. He went on to draw a parallel between Lord Randolph Churchill's case and that of Mr. Smith O'Brien, who announced in the House of Commons that, having exhausted constitutional means of redress, he intended to return to Ireland and to prepare for levying war against the British Government.

"If this country," added Mr. Gladstone, "did not possess such solid institutions, such conduct would call for severe and

serious notice." He should, however, if possible, adhere to the tolerance hitherto displayed by the Government, "unless an overruling necessity should compel me to depart from it." After much mutual recrimination, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, on behalf of the Opposition, supported the second reading of the Bill; but he took occasion to comment on the fact that such exceptional legislation should be deemed necessary when the most extensive powers of local self-government were being given to Ireland. He also drew from the debate the moral that there were, if not two races in Ireland, at least an antagonism of parties and an exasperation of feeling which completely cut the ground from under their Home Rule Bill. The second reading of the Arms Bill was then agreed to by 303 to 89, the Home Rulers recording a formal vote of opposition.

When the Committee stage of the Bill was reached (May 27), Mr. T. Healy began by moving that "no measure dealing with the disarmament of the Orange districts would be impartially administered which was put in motion by the Irish Privy Council, composed in great part of Orange sympathisers." This, after a long discussion, was negatived by 180 to 104. But Mr. Chance's attempt to reduce the operation of the Bill to December 31, 1887, was accepted, after an attempt to limit the measure to twelve months. After a few more verbal alterations, the Bill passed through Committee, and on the following day (May 28) was reported to the House and agreed to by 156 to 65, and sent to the Lords, where it was rapidly passed and received Royal Assent (June 4).

When the House of Commons next met to resume the discussion of the Government of Ireland Bill, a strong effort was made by the Conservatives to obtain Mr. Gladstone's consent to bringing the debate to an early close, and Lord Hartington supported this view by asserting that its prolongation would tend more to confuse than to elucidate the issue before the House. Mr. Gladstone at once declared that the information which had reached him was altogether at variance with the idea that there was any desire on the part of independent members to forego their rights of speaking on the Bill. He added, moreover, that the requirements of the public service necessitated a Vote on Account, which might occupy some time; and the final stages of the Arms Bill would probably occupy another evening. Under these circumstances, he would not hold out any hope of an immediate division being taken. Two wholly different causes were assigned for this desire of delay on the part of the Government. On the one hand, it was asserted that even at that time the idea of withdrawing the Bills for the session had not been altogether abandoned; on the other, it was said that the Liberal election agents were unprepared for the immediate dissolution which might follow on the rejection of the Bill—a contingency which was beginning *to be regarded* as possible. The disruption, moreover, of the

Liberal party had brought out the fact that the National Liberal Association, in separating itself from Mr. Chamberlain and his friends, had closed the principal channels which connected that body with those who had most largely supported the Liberal cause on previous occasions. The out-voting of "Birmingham" by "Leeds" in the Council of the Association had been followed by the secession of some of its more prominent members; and in view of the threatening aspect of political affairs, and the imminence of an appeal to the constituencies, a new association was set on foot under the auspices of the Unionist Liberals. The idea was warmly taken up by men of all shades of Liberal opinion, and Lord Hartington was called upon (May 22) to accept the presidency of an association which was to challenge the right of the National Liberal Association to speak and act in the name of the Liberal party. This new association, Lord Hartington explained, would give definite shape, strength, and efficiency to the opinion of that large section of the Liberal party which was opposed to the establishment of a separate Parliament for Ireland. The fight, he said, would soon be transferred to the constituencies, where they intended to carry on the contest with the same vigour as they had in Parliament. Mr. Goschen, who proposed the resolution which defined the constitution of the association, pointed out the way in which Liberal Unionists could assist in the work of organisation. Mr. Rylands said that what was going on in the House of Commons should make them more determined than ever to resist the crushing of independent opinion. He declared that the Government were adopting means for prolonging the debate, not in the hope of altering opinion, but for the purpose of bringing pressure to bear upon individual members. The Duke of Argyll, in moving the appointment of a general committee, spoke at some length on the character of the scheme which the Prime Minister had produced. He characterised it as an absurdity, and he was certain that if the vote in the House of Commons were to be taken on the merits of the Bill, ten men would not be found to support it. He had watched with some anxiety to see whether personal government could be carried to such an extent that no rebellion would be raised in the House of Commons, and it was with immense relief that he saw a man of intellect and independence like Lord Hartington ready to raise the standard, and that a large and influential body of supporters had gathered round it. He trusted that a proposal so insidious and so dangerous would not survive the opposition that had been so courageously raised and so ably conducted. In proposing a vote of thanks to Lord Hartington for his independent action in this matter, Lord Derby said he considered that the crisis was the gravest and most dangerous which had occurred within his time, and that the difficulties were not of their seeking. They had been forced upon Liberals by the Government, and they had to defend them-



selves. He cordially approved of the steps which had been taken by the association to meet the crisis. Every man who wished to preserve the integrity of the empire and the supremacy of Parliament would, he was sure, be prepared, either by his influence or by his speaking or by writing or by money, to assist in the enterprise in which they were engaged.

To return to the proceedings in Parliament, Mr. Justin M<sup>c</sup>Carthy, on behalf of the Home Rulers, promised (May 21) for the Irish Parliament that it would not be one of politicians, but of earnest practical men careful only to restore the prosperity of Ireland. Mr. Finlay, Q.C. (Inverness Burghs), argued that, as drawn, the conspicuous absence from the Bill of the clauses in the India Act, and in the Colonial Laws Act of 1865, reserving the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, would be construed by a court of justice to imply that that supremacy was not reserved; and insisted that if it were reserved, that should be frankly avowed in the Bill, in which case the Irish members would smart under the control of an "alien" Parliament, in which they are not even to be represented. He reminded the House how anxious the Irish patriots would be, in the words of Swift, "to burn everything that came from England except the coal," and how they would resent the exclusion from this Bill of any power to fix their own Customs and Excise duties. England and Ireland would, he said, in Macaulay's words, be united like the Siamese twins, "by an unnatural ligament, making each the constant plague of the other, always in each other's way; more helpless than others, because they had twice as many hands; slower than others, because they had twice as many legs; not feeling each other's pleasures, but tormented by each other's infirmities, and certain to perish miserably by each other's dissolution."

On the same evening, Mr. Rathbone, touching on the economical side of the question, pointed out how easy it would be for Ireland to ruin the owners of property through the imposition of heavy local rates, and how likely this policy would be to be acceptable to the Irish people. And, later in the evening, Mr. Childers delivered a very interesting historical speech, showing that the six reasons for Union in 1799 were reasons which would not in any way tell against the separate Legislature proposed under this Bill, since they were—first, the necessity for removing the claim of the Irish Parliament to appoint a different Regent; next, the necessity for establishing commercial relations between Great Britain and Ireland; thirdly, the necessity for removing all disputes as to the treaty-making power; fourthly, the necessity of securing Ireland Free-trade with Great Britain; fifthly, for securing Catholics from Irish disabilities by imperial laws; and sixthly, the necessity for removing the discrepancies between the Irish and English military systems. Now, said Mr. Childers, not a single one of these reasons would have any force *against the proposal* of the Government. Mr. Childers, however,

pointed out that, though the statutory Legislature in Dublin could have nothing like the large powers of Grattan's Parliament, there would be under the Bill of the Government a very great concession to Ireland which did not exist at all in the time of that Parliament—namely, the concession to any Administration which had the confidence of the new Legislature of complete executive control over the internal affairs of the country.

When the Bill next came under discussion (May 25) another Liberal whose contributions to the history of the Irish Land question had given him a certain position of authority, Lord Lyndhurst, condemned the proposed Bill as bristling with arrangements which must make it both irritating and temporary. The Attorney-General (Sir Charles Russell) followed, but he ignored completely the Irish antecedents of the question, and assumed as a matter of course that the Irish Legislature would be all that the heart could desire in its strenuousness for passing and for enforcing right laws. He replied to the threats of the Ulstermen by showing how similar threats, which meant nothing, had been uttered at the time of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church; and he insisted that it was the object of the Government to substitute for "an unreal and a paper Union, a Union founded on mutual good-will." Mr. Westlake, Q.C., Liberal member for the Romford Division of Essex, pointed out that the difficulty of the situation—at least as regarded Ulster—was identical with that involved in the relation of Croatia to Hungary. It came from within, not from without, and was due to the claim of Ireland to hold a reluctant Ulster within its grasp, just as Hungary claimed to hold a reluctant Croatia under her rule.

But the principal speech of the evening was that of Mr. G. O. Trevelyan, who in the previous Liberal Ministry had for some time been Lord Spencer's Chief Secretary, and who had left the present Administration on the unfolding of Mr. Gladstone's scheme to the Cabinet. He declared that he still adhered to the opinions in regard to Home Rule which he held a year previously, and although he admitted that, owing to the course adopted by Mr. Gladstone, the circumstances were now somewhat different, he declined to vote for the Bill in the absence of a satisfactory answer to the constitutional objections to it which had been stated by Mr. Finlay. Expounding first his financial objections to the scheme, he maintained that the Bill would not afford any means for developing the prosperity of the country. Loans, grants, bounties, public works, &c., would be looked for, but where was the money to come from? As to the tribute, he asserted it would not long be paid. There was no instance in Europe of a nation with a separate Parliament and a separate Executive which paid a predominant portion of its revenue over to another Government. We had had full warning from Mr. Parnell himself, from the orators on his side, and the Press supporting it, as to what would happen. Another objection

which he took to the Bill was that it made the Purchase Bill inevitable. The Government evidently could not trust the new Government with the administration of the Land Act of 1881, and they had given many signs that they were not easy about the future of their policy. A civil war had only been prevented in 1883 and 1884 by the presence of a strong central power, and there would be the same danger in 1887 when we had abandoned all control over law and order. He declared that he "could not vote for the Bill in its present shape;" but he owned also that it "might easily be put into a shape in which he could vote for it." All he wanted was that the preservation of law and order should not be left to the new Irish Executive, for then it would not be necessary to pass the Land Purchase Bill, which under any other circumstances must inevitably follow, and to which he had the most rooted objection.

The next few days were busily occupied by the party managers on all sides in making final preparations for the division and its anticipated outcome; and, in view of the difficulties which it was said many Liberals found in pledging themselves to support the Government, Mr. Gladstone called together at the Foreign Office (May 27) a meeting of the Liberals which was attended by about 260 members, to explain the position of the Ministry with regard to the Irish Bill. Addressing himself particularly to those of the Liberal party "who are desirous, while retaining full freedom on all the particulars of the Irish Government Bill, to vote in favour of the establishment of a legislative body in Dublin for the management of the affairs specifically and exclusively Irish," Mr. Gladstone referred first to the "clearing of the air" since the outspoken declarations of Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington. He then said that what the Government desired was to establish by a vote on the second reading of the Government of Ireland Bill the principle of the measure, which was the establishment in Ireland of a legislative body with the conduct of Irish as distinguished from Imperial affairs. The responsibility of proceeding to the adoption of such a principle, he said, was enormous, and he could not conceive anything so deplorable as the position of the Government which, after having proposed such a principle, showed the slightest wavering from it either in the shape of recession from the assertion of it in bulk, or in the shape of being parties to emasculating that principle, and converting it into a mockery, a delusion, and a snare, which was intended to be a great and a substantial offering for the future peace and happiness of Ireland. He argued that members who did not altogether agree with the Bill might still vote for the second reading and see to its amendment in Committee. That course, he said, would be in accordance with the spirit of parliamentary rules. He also repudiated the idea that voting for the second reading of that Bill would bind a member to vote for the *Land Purchase Bill*. "I am aware," he continued, "that there

are certain points the full discussion of which must be reserved for the House of Commons; but there are several points which many gentlemen of the party feel as touching their own position, and as possibly bearing on their own intentions in regard to the second reading of the Bill. I think, in regard to all these points, it is right that I should, without entering into argument upon them, state the position in the view of the Government, in order to afford you such assistance as I can."

In prohibiting the endowment of religious bodies, the Government gave a pledge from which it would be impossible to recede. As to the supremacy of the Imperial Legislature, Mr. Gladstone said:

"You may consider this question of supremacy as a question of power in the abstract, or you may consider it with respect to the use to be made of that power and the moral obligation which attaches to that use. Now that distinction is fundamental; for I believe it to be beyond all doubt and question that the Imperial Legislature is absolutely what is called omnipotent. But I believe there is one thing which is beyond the power of Parliament, and that is to divest itself of its powers. And why is it in the nature of things impossible for it to divest itself of its powers? Because its powers are not its own, because they are the powers of the nation, because the powers of the nation, received from the nation, are nevertheless in their exercise entirely summed up in the Parliament and can be used only by the hands of the Parliament; but Parliament, not being their original owner and master, cannot give them away. It does not signify what you enact. Your power of repealing the enactment, even if you gave it all away, is exactly the same as for the enactment. And undoubtedly Parliament can do this."

Referring to the proposed exclusion of Irish members from the Imperial Parliament, Mr. Gladstone thus defined the position:—

"We have long ago—at the very commencement of this debate—announced that, with respect to questions of taxation, if it be agreeable to the will of the House, we are quite willing to undertake the responsibility of framing and submitting a plan which would entitle Irish representatives to be invited to Parliament when any proposal for taxation is made which affects the condition of Ireland. The effect of that pledge which we have given would be to entail a liberal change in the construction, not of the Bill generally, but of a very limited but still important portion of the Bill which relates to the position of the Irish members in regard to the Imperial Parliament." He would not refer to any of the minor changes he made in moving the second reading of the Bill, but the question of taxation was one which touched the root of the question about the retention of Irish members for certain purposes: "I have heard it suggested that Ireland should maintain for her representatives a title to be heard upon Imperial and reserved matters. I should say that '*Imperial and reserved*' are substantial equivalents

for the purpose of any statement of this kind. I may be permitted to quote two or three words of what I said in regard to this suggestion. I said, 'That end, we say distinctly, is a good end, and the means for attaining it we regard with favour.' It was a fact that at that moment no plan had been placed before us. It was also a fact that we had not seen our way into the interior of the question so far as to be able to say 'There is a plan.' I have stated certain conditions which are in our view essential. First of all, we should not on any consideration interfere with the liberty of the Irish legislative body, or be parties to any provisions that would introduce anarchy and confusion into the Imperial Parliament. Subject to these conditions, we were prepared to consider the question."

Mr. Gladstone concluded by saying that after the second reading of the Bill was affirmed, no further steps would be taken for passing the measure that session. Two courses would then be open to the Government—to keep the Bill alive and proceed with the clauses in the autumn; or to wind up the session at an early date, and to summon Parliament at an early day for a fresh session, when the Bill would be reintroduced with the necessary amendments—and he thought the latter course would be best adapted to secure the passing of the measure. Considerable discussion followed Mr. Gladstone's speech, which was heartily received by those present, so far as might be judged from their spokesmen. Mr. Dillwyn welcomed it on behalf of the Welsh members; and Mr. Whitbread warned all members who wished for some form of Home Rule from voting against the second reading of the Bill on account of their objection to its details.

The outcome of this meeting which made apparently the most impression on the public mind was the now admitted fact that the House of Commons was debating an abstract resolution and that all reference to the Land Purchase Bill had been somewhat ostentatiously ignored by Mr. Gladstone and his chief supporters. In connection, moreover, with this latter point, the simultaneous publication of a correspondence between Captain Verney, M.P., and the Prime Minister gave greater significance to the assertion, that Ministers were anxious to win back the support of those advanced Radicals who, like Mr. Chamberlain, had been alienated by the proposal of involving the Imperial Exchequer in so large a pecuniary liability. "It is, and should be seen to be indispensable," wrote Mr. Gladstone, "that a vote for the second reading of the Irish Government Bill given by an independent member, leaves the giver of it absolutely free as to his vote on the Land Purchase Bill."

The Premier's speech at the Foreign Office was not, however, allowed to pass unnoticed in the House of Commons, and provoked a heated discussion, the result of which in many minds finally determined the fate of the Irish Bill. Sir M. Hicks-



Beach, at the beginning of the sitting, put a question to Mr. Gladstone in order to ascertain in what position he stood to the Home Rule Bill, and what effect the change of procedure foreshadowed by the Foreign Office speech would have upon the Bill and upon Parliament. Was or was not the Bill to be withdrawn after the second reading? Was there to be a speedy prorogation of Parliament, to be followed by the introduction of an amended Bill in an autumn session, or was the session to be wound up by an adjournment, and the present Bill to be proceeded with when the House was called together in the autumn? Mr. Gladstone in his reply tried his very hardest to avoid showing his hand. He hinted that of the two courses open to him he should "prefer" a prorogation of Parliament, with the consequent reintroduction of the Bill, to go through all its stages afresh; but he could not speak positively, and the House was reduced to a condition of absolute bewilderment. It seemed so hopelessly impossible to extract any definite intention from the words, that the leader of the Opposition at once asked leave, in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's unsatisfactory explanation, to move the adjournment of the House. The Ministerialists shouted "No!" but when the Speaker asked whether Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had the support of forty members for his demand, the Conservative party rose in a body, and Sir Michael was invited to proceed, and in a short and bitter speech denounced the tortuous policy which the Government was adopting. He taunted Mr. Gladstone with his own lofty declarations—that "the House had before it a Cabinet determined in its purpose," with "an intelligible plan" and "speaking with one voice"; that "nobody else had any plan"; and that the plan of the Government "still held the field." Yet now the House was asked to vote on "some undefined plan which nobody could explain or put into definite shape." Mr. Gladstone had talked of the "danger" of approaching Parliament with plans which "might mean anything or nothing," which might perhaps "conciliate the feelings of the people of Ireland for a moment and attract a passing breath of popularity, but which, when the day of trial came, would be found utterly to fail." Yet that was precisely the method which the Prime Minister was asking the House to pursue. Mr. Gladstone had dwelt upon the great urgency of this legislation; but, in his own language, his present action would "paralyse the sources of law and order and prolong an uncertainty as to the future which must prove a great national evil." The Government Bill was now to be "remodelled"; but how? It was quite unprecedented for a Government to bring forward a great scheme of constitutional government, "boasting that it held the field," and then to withdraw it, getting the House to assent instead to "an abstract and undefined resolution." This was in truth "trifling with Parliament" and "with the first duty of a Government, to restore

and maintain social order." The Bill had now become "a mere Continuance-in-Office Bill"; and, Sir Michael went on, pointing a scornful forefinger at the Treasury bench, "this new course is proposed in order that her Majesty's Government may sit on that bench without the power to carry out their policy." In order to extract "something like a real definition of the Prime Minister's policy," the Opposition leader moved the adjournment of the House.

When Sir M. Hicks-Beach sat down there was a long pause, and the Speaker had already risen to put the question, when Mr. Gladstone, laying aside a letter on which he was engaged, rose to reply. He said he would not condescend to answer this imputation of motives, but, with regard to trifling with law and order, he believed Ireland was in the same condition as in the autumn, when the late Government were so satisfied with it, and he believed also that the people of Ireland would rally round the cause of law and order when they saw that Parliament was in earnest with this question. The Government were responsible for their conduct, and they had to consider that a large number of members favourable to the Bill had desired further time to consider it, that the question was not only urgent but novel, and that the Bill contained many new proposals. The Government were determined to go through with the measure without flinching a hair's breadth from its scope and purport; but, while willing to defer to their friends, they would not adopt the tactics of their opponents, but would choose their own mode and methods of action. As to reconstruction, that did not apply to the Bill, but to a single clause touching the future relations of Irish members to the Imperial Parliament, and he denied that in asking the House to read the Bill a second time he was only asking for an abstract resolution. On the contrary, he repeated in the strongest manner that he regarded it as a solemn pledge from Parliament that a legislative body for the management of Irish affairs, as distinguished from Imperial, ought to be established, and that Parliament would do it at the earliest possible moment.

With regard to the chances of legislation during that session, Mr. Gladstone declared that time was wanting to pass a Bill, containing a mass of matter almost every line of which involved some new proposition which justified and even required prolonged consideration. Then there were perils to be encountered "in another place"; for if the Bill went up to the Lords in August, they might say they had not time to consider it. As Mr. Gladstone had perfect confidence in the final issue, he was not going to adopt his rule of tactics from the Opposition. He finally concluded his warm and spirited reply: "The right honourable gentleman has moved the adjournment of the House. I am glad he has; and in order to mark our sense of *his proceeding*, we shall negative that adjournment."

Lord Randolph Churchill followed with a taunting speech, which greatly provoked the occupants of the Treasury bench. He defied the Prime Minister, "with his parliamentary knowledge and experience," to show a single precedent for the course proposed. No Government had ever introduced a Bill of first-class importance and then told their followers, "If you only vote for the second reading we will withdraw it, and you shall never hear of it again." The vital point was as to whether there was to be an adjournment or a prorogation, and he asked Mr. Gladstone why he would not "present a fair issue and stick to his guns," adding, amid a storm of Ministerial wrath, "We are being jockeyed." On the question of want of time, he taunted the Prime Minister with the delays he had purposely introduced to prevent the progress of the Bill; and as for the action of the Peers, while admitting Mr. Gladstone's greater right to speak for that body, "for he had made a good many of them," he emphatically denied that the Upper Chamber would put forward "any such frivolous excuse." The decision of the Peers upon the Bill would be ruled by other considerations, and it would be "serious, calm, immediate, and final." It was an "insult to the House of Commons" that the Prime Minister should give important information to a certain group, and refuse it to the whole body, the refusal being based upon "the most frivolous and ridiculous pretexts." But the object of the right honourable gentleman was clear: he did not wish to go to the country, and the "great bribe" he offered to members to support the second reading was that there should be no dissolution for another nine or twelve months. The manœuvres of the Government were worthy of "an old parliamentary hand"; but they were such as statesmen like Grey, Althorp, and Peel would never have condescended to; and he further aroused the ire of the Ministerialists by protesting in a concluding sentence against this attempt to "hoccuss the House of Commons."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir W. Harcourt) began his reply by solemnly reproving the previous speaker for the use of such words as "jockey" and "hoccuss." "This," he said, "is the language of the Derby."—"No," replied Lord R. Churchill across the table—"it is the language of the Hoax." Sir W. Harcourt with some difficulty restored seriousness to the House, and then went on to argue that there had been no ambiguity in Mr. Gladstone's language, and that it was impossible for a Minister to announce a decision on the question of prorogation or dissolution without the authority of the Crown. But the Marquess of Hartington, who followed, at once showed the instability of this line of defence, and literally wrung from the Government the information they had so studiously attempted to withhold. Nobody, he thought, had any right to complain of the motion for adjournment; for the House had a right to the information which was given unofficially to a section of it on the

previous day. It was embarrassing and inconvenient that the House should have been debating the Bill hitherto under one set of circumstances, and that the debate was now to be resumed under an entirely different set. A prorogation would involve a new Bill with all its different stages, an adjournment the present Bill with its second reading already passed; and the House had a right to know which of the two courses was to be pursued. Here the Chancellor of the Exchequer attempted explanations in a series of asides; but Lord Hartington, after repeating one or two of them to the House, had to enter a mild protest against "the inconvenience of addressing the House and keeping up a conversation with his right honourable friend at one and the same time." Sir William Harcourt was therefore compelled to rise again, though with evident reluctance, and make at last a plain and open declaration of all that the House wanted to know. Lord Hartington was observing, "I am quite aware that the Queen prorogues, and not the Prime Minister; but my right honourable friend is not debarred from stating what advice he has tendered to her Majesty," when the Chancellor of the Exchequer rose with the words, "I did say that that was the advice we would tender to the Queen." Here came a multitude of voices in chorus, "What advice?" and the right honourable gentleman went on, "To take the course of prorogation." Lord Hartington made instant profit of the information so slowly and laboriously extorted. "The House will now agree more than ever," he said, "that this motion for adjournment was not uncalled for;" and he went on to point out that the House was asked to do what was never before done in the case of an important Bill—assent to the second reading of a Bill which it knew the Government did not intend to prosecute during the present session, and which, therefore, under no conceivable circumstances could be passed into law. Every member would therefore vote, not on the principle of the measure, but simply on the question whether he desired to force the Government to dissolve Parliament. "The Prime Minister," he proceeded, amid a storm of cheers, "can produce no precedent, with all his parliamentary experience, for asking the House to vote for the second reading of a Bill which is dead." Lord Hartington finally asked what was to become of the Land Purchase Bill; and though Mr. T. P. O'Connor tried hard to stop him, he did not succeed. The two Bills had been declared by the Prime Minister to be "inseparable"; were they now, notwithstanding, to be separated? But to this inconvenient question no answer was forthcoming from the Treasury bench.

The discussion was continued for a while, but all interest had now evaporated from it. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach asked leave to withdraw his motion; but Mr. Gladstone cried "No, no," and the rest of the Ministerialists followed suit. Even then there would have been no division, and the motion would have

been simply negatived, had not the Parnellites fancied they could compel the Opposition to vote in a small minority, and insisted on dividing the House. The leader of the Opposition laughed, and when the time came for appointing tellers the Opposition refused to name any; so the Parnellites, the only section insisting on dividing the House, had to supply them themselves. Then the whole Conservative party—indeed the whole House, with one solitary exception—trooped out into the Ministerial lobby with the Government; and to the Parnellites was left the melancholy satisfaction of justifying the division by sending one of their own band—Mr. Crilly—through the “Aye” lobby. The result was that the motion for adjournment was rejected by 405 votes to one.

What little reality had up to this clung to the debate on the second reading of the Irish Bill was dissipated by this discussion. The only reason for putting off the division was the hope that some of “the waverers” might be induced by the personal influence of Mr. Gladstone or by the pressure of the local caucuses to record their votes in support of the abstract principle of Home Rule. Outside the ranks of the official Liberals, Sir Thomas Acland was one of the few who spoke (May 28) in support of the Bill, but he made no concealment of his misgivings as to its outcome; but it was not until Mr. Chamberlain explained his attitude (June 1), in a long and closely reasoned speech, that public interest in the debate revived. At the outset of his remarks he declared that he would not refer to the personal attacks so freely made on him, because, though they enlivened the debate, they were not up to the level of this great occasion. Premising that the Bill was dead, he said there were two courses open to the Government—either to withdraw the Bill (which he did not believe Mr. Gladstone would submit to), proposing at the same time an abstract resolution, for which probably he would have voted, and the course which he was now taking. But the Prime Minister made it impossible for members who disliked the Bill to content themselves with abstaining from voting, because he maintained that every one who voted for the second reading would be logically and honourably committed to vote for it or the same Bill in the next session. Defending his own consistency, he asserted that he had never been in favour of cutting off the Irish representation from the House of Commons, believing that it was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. At this the Irish members here called “No,” and Mr. Chamberlain challenged any one of them to say that he desired to maintain the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, to which several replied by again calling “No.” The amendments by which the Prime Minister endeavoured to meet the objections on this head would reduce the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament to a spasmodic sham. On this point he said *that the opponents of the Bill, if they could*



help it, would not allow the Irish members to be supreme either at Westminster or Dublin. This was received with interruptions from the Irish members, which were reproved by the Speaker, and drew from Mr. Chamberlain the comment that they augured very badly for the peace and order of the Irish Parliament. In regard to Ulster, he protested against Mr. Gladstone's insinuation that the people who clung to the traditions of the United Kingdom were unsympathetic and unpatriotic, and he insisted that the House must have further information as to what the Government intended to do for Ulster. If the Bill had presented any elements of finality, he would have accepted it, much as he disliked it; but the Irish members had never said that they would so accept it, and, if they had, they could not bind the Irish people. Mr. Parnell, as he showed by quotations from his speeches, was precluded from closing with this Bill as a final settlement. Discussing the example of Canada, he pointed out that a lesson for solving the Irish difficulty might be found in the relations of the provinces *inter se* and their relations to the Dominion Parliament, and said that as the scheme and the amendments were unsatisfactory, he must vote against the second reading. As for a dissolution, it had no terrors for him, for though he recognized the passionate attachment of the British democracy to the Prime Minister and the universality of the feeling in favour of some form of Home Rule, he denied that the people had pronounced in favour of this method of carrying it. Finally, referring to the charge that he was actuated by spleen and spite, he asked whether this would be said of Mr. Bright when he went into the lobby against the Bill, and boldly vindicating his own line of action and that of the Radicals who acted with him, he declared that every personal and political interest he had would have led him to cast in his lot with the Prime Minister, "but," he added, "I am not base enough to serve my personal ambition by betraying my country."

To Mr. Sexton fell the congenial task of attacking with animosity, occasionally touched with flashes of humour, the statesman by whom, in the eyes of Irish Home Rulers, their hopes of emancipation from British control and supremacy had been first excited and subsequently prostrated. Mr. Sexton described Mr. Chamberlain as the ally of the Tories and the confederate of Whigs, whose object, while acting the rôle of a Radical, was to secure the downfall of the Prime Minister. Drawing an adverse comparison between his action and that of Lord Hartington, which he admitted was straightforward, he argued that the spirit of class armed the main body of the host opposed to the Bill. He pointed out that the real question for the country lay between the offer of peace made by Mr. Gladstone and the twenty years of coercion of Lord Salisbury, who, he sarcastically remarked, had crawled into office last year by coquetting *with a policy* which he now repudiated with the same object.

The Irish nation, he said, was willing that the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament should be maintained in reference to Imperial matters ; but it would not consent to its proceedings in relation to local affairs being systematically reviewed and its will annulled by any other Legislature. He also repudiated the proposal to separate Ulster, and repeated that the majority of Ulstermen were in favour of the Bill.

On behalf of the Government, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir W. Harcourt) confined himself almost exclusively to the constitutional aspect of the question, and argued that the dangers to the Union on which the opponents of the Bill so strongly insisted had been foreseen and guarded against. He commenced his speech by reading Grattan's "Declaration of Right" and numerous extracts from the speeches and writings of statesmen of the time, showing that it did not excite any protest. He contended that the condition of Ireland now was worse than it was before the Union, and denied that it was a foreign country during Grattan's Parliament. The proposed Legislature would be similar in its basis to colonial Parliaments, which did not attempt to interfere with the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament in relation to Imperial matters, and he was satisfied that the Irish Legislature would not attempt to act differently. He next discussed alternative policies, and, repeating the familiar quotations from Lord Salisbury's speech, fixing him with a twenty years' coercive policy, twitted Lord Hartington with not having directly accepted or repudiated the traditional Tory policy in his Bradford speech.

At the close of the sitting, Sir M. Hicks-Beach having announced that the occupants of the front Opposition bench would take no further part in the debate, it was left to be carried on by the supporters and opponents of the Bill on the Ministerial side of the House. Amongst the former Mr. T. O'Connor stood forward as one of the most outspoken and thoroughgoing. He started with the contention that the objection as to the supremacy of Parliament and the certainty of ultimate separation had been conclusively answered, and asserted that not only would the guarantee for Union derived from England's material strength remain untouched, but the moral force springing from affection and good will would be increased tenfold. The Bill, he said, was in most danger from its friends, and, enlarging on this point, he made some sarcastic comments on Mr. Chamberlain's numerous plans, and insisted that the House had a right to have the full text of Mr. Bright's letter laid before it, and to know whether he advised a division which would precipitate a dissolution. Any one who was in favour of establishing a legislative body in Ireland was bound to vote for the Bill ; and regarding this Bill as only a draft, he said that when Mr. Gladstone reintroduced the Bill in the autumn he would not be at liberty to abandon this main principle nor any one of the conditions by which he had sur-

rounded it. As to a dissolution, he believed that a weak Conservative Government meant Home Rule within a short time; but the Conservatives would not have the same assistance from the Irish vote as they received at the general election, the nature of which he illustrated by numerous extracts from private communications and public declarations.

Mr. Winterbotham, on the other hand, a Liberal and a Dissenter who had recently wrested a division of East Gloucester from the Conservatives, contrasted the glib adulation now showered on the Prime Minister by the Irish members with their vile abuse of him during the general election, and made quotations from the speeches of Sir William Harcourt and other Ministers during the campaign denouncing the Tory alliance with the Irish party whom they themselves were now endeavouring to satisfy. Defending the Independent Liberals, he protested warmly against the intolerance and the denial of liberty of speech by which the Bill was supported, and expressed his conviction that those who could not bring themselves to follow Mr Gladstone in this matter had nothing to fear from the country or the Liberal party. The Bill, he showed, was not only a direct violation of the pledges of the Liberal party at the last election but it would not carry out the conditions which Mr. Gladstone had laid down, and he earnestly pressed on the Prime Minister to withdraw it, and bring in a fresh Bill in the autumn.

In this line of protest and objection he was followed by Mr Wodehouse and Sir Julian Goldsmid, both of whom urged that no Liberals could on such an occasion divest themselves of personal responsibility, or had any right to take shelter behind the assumed infallibility of their leader. But the most serious contribution to the discussion was the speech of the Chief Secretary (Mr. John Morley), who almost alone among the supporters of the Bill seriously grappled with the criticisms to which it had been subjected. Leaving to his colleagues to make appeal to the sympathies, allegiance, and hesitations of the Liberal party, Mr. Morley at once set himself to reply to "the sophisms and fallacies" of those who had opposed the Bill. The crisis, he maintained, went much deeper than a mere Parliamentary one, and, replying to Lord Hartington, he dwelt on the immense changes which had come over the Irish political scene since O'Connell's time. As to meeting the crisis by a measure of mere local self-government, he maintained that every institution of Government had broken down in our hands for want of the element of popular consent. In the same manner no reform of administration would be expected without responsibility to an Irish Legislature and an Irish Executive. To our system of governing Ireland he attributed the economic demoralisation of the country, the authority of priesthood over education, and many other evils. As to the parliamentary position, he said the Government would *only expect those to vote with them who agreed with them that*

there was but one way of removing the evils of Ireland—by the establishment of a statutory body in Dublin with legislative power to deal with affairs specifically and exclusively Irish. The Government, he said, did not regret that they had proceeded by Bill and not by resolution, as it had shown them where the difficulties lay. They had never expected to win the battle at one blow, or to carry the Bill without modification; and though they did not intend to introduce a brand-new Bill, they were open to consider all reasonable modifications under the conditions laid down at the Foreign Office, in which, he repeated, there had been no change. With regard to the position in which Liberals would find themselves if they voted for the Bill under discussion, he added, “to vote for the second reading is to vote for the principle of an autonomous Legislature for dealing with specifically Irish affairs. We are not going to propose a brand-new Bill, or to present a Bill turned inside out. . . . We contend that the Bill which is to be produced in the autumn may contain some modifications.”

Another evening (June 4) was given up to unofficial speeches, and at length the twelfth and last night (June 7) of the protracted discussion arrived. The debate was resumed by Mr. Goschen, who began his speech by asserting that, in consequence of the numerous surprises and explanations of the previous fortnight, few members knew exactly what they were called upon to vote. The abstract principle which was proposed to them might, if valid, contain a wish, but it committed its supporters to no plan. The Bill described as a message of love to Ireland was, it appeared, to be torn up before the ink was dry, and members were in the dark whether the Government was or was not pledged to reconstruct their Bill before the autumn. At this point Mr. Gladstone interfered by declaring that on a previous occasion he had “indignantly repudiated the cool statement that he had proposed to reconstruct the Bill.” To this correction Mr. Goschen at once submitted, pointing out that the issue had been explained in the opposite sense by one of Mr. Gladstone’s own supporters (Sir J. Pease), whose version had called forth no contradiction at the time. Whatever the result of the division might be, Mr. Goschen held that the opponents of the Bills had reason to be satisfied, for they would not be passed. There were also other changes on which the Ministry were to be congratulated; the Chief Secretary for Ireland no longer talked of “dark subterranean forces” which were to help the Bill in its course; the “alarmist Home Secretary” of the previous Liberal Administration was able to reappear as Chancellor of the Exchequer with great light-heartedness, but he had meanwhile “bound on his arm, over his ministerial uniform, the badge of Home Rule worn by the followers of the hon. member for Cork.” Touching upon the “truce of God” which had been temporarily proclaimed between Ireland and England, Mr. Goschen warned the

House that the state of some parts of the former country revealed the fact that "the devil was at work still," and that before an appeal could be made to the English democracy to do justice to Ireland, it should be shown that justice could be administered in Ireland unawed. Mr. Goschen then went on to describe the Bill as a bundle of impossibilities, not the result of hasty drafting, but of difficulties inherent to the question. He pressed the Government to say more plainly whether the Irish Government Bill was still inseparably tied up with the Land Scheme, as stated by Mr. Gladstone at an earlier date; whether when the Bill came again before the House in its reconstructed form the Land Purchase Bill would be connected with it; what notice it was proposed to take of the earnest pleading of Ulster; and lastly, whether the clause which referred to the disappearance of the representatives from Ireland as permanent and integral members of the House of Commons would be dropped from the Bill. This last point he not only regarded as the basis of the Bill, but it really underlay the other vital question of the sovereignty of Parliament; whilst with the others was bound up the essential question of the protection of minorities. Although Mr. Goschen did not believe in the revival of persecution in its old-fashioned forms, he held that under Home Rule the Protestants would be elbowed out in various ways. The lay leaders of the Nationalist party would be, and doubtless were, eager for complete toleration, but the Roman Catholic priesthood would act in Ireland as it acted elsewhere, and claim that ascendancy in education which was claimed by every church. Turning next to the financial aspect of the question, Mr. Goschen maintained that the Bill would probably produce disaster, certainly friction, and "if we wish to have this as a final settlement, we must take care that there is no friction; for friction may upset the settlement; and the upsetting of the settlement may mean separation. I say, therefore, that this Bill carries in it the seeds of political, commercial, financial, and, above all, of executive friction." Mr. Goschen went on to deal with the action of the separate Cabinet and the separate Executive sketched out in the Bill, which would prove a fruitful source of friction; for the Irish Executive might at any moment involve Ireland in difficulties, out of which Great Britain would have to extricate her. "It has been assumed," Mr. Goschen continued, "that if you grant Home Rule to Ireland the grant will be followed by smiling plenty in every part of the country—that the land question, that the poverty of Ireland, and that all those causes of misery which reach so deep down into her social system will vanish. But is that so? Can you hope that the poverty of Ireland will be cured when she has been, so to speak, cut adrift from the richer country? Do you think that there will be no discontent, that that discontent will not culminate in agitation, and that that *agitation* may not once more be used as an argument for a fur-



ther disturbance of the settlement, and, ultimately, for separation? And then, remember, we must keep before our minds the words of warning of the Chief Secretary. You are told Ireland has a moral support which she never had before. You are told that the Irish Americans will place resources at her disposal of which she never had an idea before. You have parted with your Executive Government, you have alienated the friends of England in Ireland—perhaps turned them into your bitterest foes. You have placed the Executive in new and untried hands. Then, it is said, even supposing under all these circumstances there is that friction, that agitation, those difficulties, are you not 30,000,000 and they are only 5,000,000 in Ireland? Suppression by force is held out to us as a remedy for this state of things. But if that be so it will be said, “You have changed all the conditions.” Mr. Goschen went on to protest against the Premier’s raising the question of class. “There are some old rafters which are holding the framework of British society together, but fling them into the fire. Steam we must have, or else we cannot pass our Bill.” After looking on the false interpretations placed by some speakers on the word coercion, and contrasting with it the pressure brought to bear upon Liberal representatives at that moment to “follow an illustrious statesman,” Mr. Goschen concluded his speech in the following emphatic words: “Sir, the democracy of this country is now enthroned for the first time, so to speak, in office, and it has to face for the first time this tremendous responsibility. I say do not let it be hustled into a fatal and irrevocable step. Do not let the first chapter in this new volume of our history open with a breach in the Constitution, and with a sapping of the foundations which bear the weight of this colossal empire. I said that this step was irrevocable. Why is it irrevocable? We may summon back the members from Ireland for a special purpose, or we may summon them back in order to modify the Act we are now passing. But depend upon it, if they are so summoned back, they will be summoned back not to tighten the bonds but to widen the breach, and so I say it is an irrevocable Act. We are maiming for ever the Constitution of this country, and let us remember that we are but life trustees. Let us remember, too, with reference to foreign opinion, that no foreign country ever has had or has now a Parliament such as ours. We are told of colonial opinion. But the legislative assemblies in the colonies are not like the mother Parliament. We are told of legislative assemblies of former centuries, but they had not the duties, the privileges, the responsibilities of ours. They did not hold in their hands, as we do, the supreme and concentrated powers of the State. So I say, remember that we are life trustees. Let us feel that we are bound to hand on that glorious possession which we have inherited unimpaired and unimpeached, without waste and detriment, to those who are to come after us. I implore this House, by the traditions of which we are the heirs,

by every present obligation of duty and honour, by our hopes in the mighty and beneficent future of this great empire, by our duty to the Sovereign who rules over these realms, I implore this House, let us look to it that those who come after us may bear witness that we have not betrayed our trust."

Mr. Parnell at once followed, and began by remarking that Mr. Goschen, who had been the supporter of many lost causes, joined with him in deprecating outrages, whether they took place in Kerry or Ulster. While attributing recent crime to the language lately used by Lord R. Churchill and Mr. Chamberlain, he read a statement showing that the recent disturbance at Belfast had originated with a Protestant and not with a Roman Catholic workman, as stated in the English newspapers. Turning to the Bill, he admitted that he would at one time have preferred the restoration of Grattan's Parliament, but he now saw advantages in an Irish Legislature established for Home Government only, being limited and subordinated to the Imperial Parliament. He maintained that under the Bill the British Parliament would retain unimpaired the same power and authority with respect to Ireland that it possessed now, and, in answer to the objection that the Bill contained no element of finality, he insisted that the Bill had been freely, cheerfully, and gladly accepted by all the leaders of national feeling both in Ireland and America. Not a single dissentient voice had been raised against the Bill by any Irishman holding national opinions; and as for Mr. Patrick Ford, the Irish party had not agreed with him for five or six years. Dealing next with the question of Ulster, he refused to assent to its separation from the proposed scheme; and with regard to the retention of the Irish members he preferred to keep his mind open. Personally he had no objection to their retention, but he believed that great difficulties would ensue, and that ultimately it would be the English members and not the Irish who would object to their being retained. He said, in conclusion, that before the General Election the leaders of the Conservative party distinctly offered, in the event of their obtaining a majority, to submit not only a plan for the complete autonomous government of Ireland, but also a scheme of land purchase on a much larger scale than that proposed by Mr. Gladstone; and predicted that if the Bill were lost coercion of a more stringent nature than that hitherto adopted would have to be resorted to. Referring to the coercion of the past five years, Mr. Parnell explained how it had been carried out, admitting at the same time that it was the only alternative to the settlement now proposed. He continued: "During the last five years I know, Sir, there have been very severe and drastic Coercion Bills; but it will require an even severer and more drastic measure of coercion now. You will require all that you have had during the last five years, and more besides. What, Sir, has that coercion been? You have had, Sir, during

those five years—I do not say this to inflame passion—you have had during those five years the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; you have had a thousand of your Irish fellow-subjects held in prison without specific charge, many of them for long periods of time, some of them for twenty months, without trial and without any intention of placing them on trial (I think of all these thousand persons arrested under the Coercion Act of the late Mr. Forster scarcely a dozen were put on their trial); you have had the Arms Act, you have had the suspension of trial by jury—all during the last five years. You have authorised your police to enter the domicile of a citizen, of your fellow-subject in Ireland, at any hour of the day or night, and to search every part of this domicile, even the beds of the women, without warrant. You have fined the innocent for offences committed by the guilty; you have taken power to expel aliens from this country; you have revived the Curfew Law and the blood-money of your Norman conquerors; you have gagged the press and seized and suppressed newspapers; you have manufactured new crimes and offences, and applied fresh penalties unknown to your law for these crimes and offences. All this you have done for five years, and all this and much more you will have to do again. The provision in the Bill for terminating the representation of Irish members has been very vehemently objected to, and Mr. Trevelyan has said that there is no halfway house between separation and the maintenance of law and order in Ireland by Imperial authority. I say with just as much sincerity of belief, and just as much experience as the right hon. gentleman, that, in my judgment, there is no halfway house between the concession of legislative autonomy to Ireland and the disfranchisement of the country and her government as a Crown colony. But, Sir, I refuse to believe that these evil days must come. I am convinced there are a sufficient number of wise and just members in this House to cause it to disregard appeals made to passion, and to choose the better way of founding peace and goodwill among nations, and when the numbers in the division lobby come to be told, it will also be told for the admiration of all future generations that England and her Parliament, in this nineteenth century, were wise enough, brave enough, and generous enough to close the strife of centuries, and to give peace and prosperity to suffering Ireland.”

After a few unimportant speeches on either side, Mr. J. Cowen made an eloquent defence of Home Rule, of which he had been a lifelong advocate. Sir M. Hicks-Beach then rose and commenced by saying, important as the Bill was, its history was more important, for it did not embody the policy of a party or of its leaders. It was the production of one man, who had not been converted until he saw that he could not get a majority in the new House of Commons without the assistance of the Irish members. Referring to Mr. Parnell's statement that he had

reason to expect from the late Conservative Government a statutory Parliament with power to protect Irish industries, he said, amid loud cheers from the Opposition, that for himself and his colleagues he categorically denied that they had ever any such intention.

Here Mr. Parnell rose, and asked whether the right honourable gentleman denied that that intention was communicated to him by one of his colleagues, a Minister of the Crown, to which Sir M. Hicks-Beach replied, "Yes, I do deny it," and added that if any one had made such a statement it was without authority. At this there were loud cries of "Name," and Sir M. Hicks-Beach went on to say that Mr. Parnell would do the late Government a great pleasure if he would state the name of the person who had made the statement. Amid much cheering and counter-cheering Mr. Parnell said that was a safe appeal, but he would be glad to give the name of the right honourable gentleman's colleague when that colleague gave him permission. To this Sir M. Hicks-Beach retorted that insinuations were easily made but that to prove them was a very different thing. He followed up this distinct denial by declaring that the rules of the code of honour of the Irish members stopped short of application at the point where proof became necessary. The Conservative leader then went on to sketch the history of the measure. "Although the Cabinet was formed on a very early day in February, it was not till March 13 that the first intimation was made to it that the first edition of the right hon. gentleman's plan was ready to be submitted to his colleagues. That fact the right hon. gentleman stated to the House himself, and it was not until March 26 that the complete scheme was submitted to the Cabinet, which was identical, with the important exception of the clause relating to the control of the Customs and Excise with that which was submitted to the House upon April 8. . . . I venture to say that these dates show conclusively that the right hon. gentleman is alone, or, perhaps, in conjunction with the Chief Secretary for Ireland, responsible for this scheme, and that the Cabinet really never had a voice upon the matter. If I wanted proof of that I would refer to the debate upon the first reading of the Bill, when, in answer to all our arguments and to all our inquiries, no one member of the Cabinet, with the two exceptions of the Prime Minister and the Chief Secretary for Ireland, could say a single word upon the subject, though the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a remarkable speech referred us to what we should see in the Bill when it was printed and circulated. But no sooner was the Bill printed—and it was not until a week after it had been read a first time that it was printed—than doubts began to arise in the mind of its author as to its provisions. On May 1 the right hon. gentleman began to minimise his own scheme. The right hon. gentleman then told *us that we had not to deal with details and particulars, and that*

we had only to decide whether or not we would have regard to the prayer of Ireland for the management by herself of affairs specifically and exclusively her own."

Sir M. Hicks-Beach next proceeded to describe the concessions, the modifications, the explanations, and the withdrawals which were promised by the Premier in the hope that by means of them he might unite his party in support of his scheme. But even that did not suffice. All this required delay no doubt, and there were at work subterranean influences which somehow or another delayed the judgment of Parliament on the great scheme. Never was a Government so little anxious to all appearance to obtain the judgment of the House of Commons upon a proposal to effect great alterations in the law. How had the interval been spent by the wirepullers of the Liberal party? Every method of persuasion, of influence, of intimidation, and of abuse had been used against members who, because they could not depart from the principles they had hitherto held with the same facility as the Government, had been branded as traitors and deserters. Even yet the issue was clouded or attempted to be clouded by the supporters of the Premier.

Sir M. Hicks-Beach then went on to deal with the various and frequently contradictory arguments which had been put forward in support of the Bill. For all practical purposes he insisted that the Bill did away with the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament and handed it over to the Parliament in Dublin. As to the presence of the Irish members, the proposed alterations, while they would irreparably injure the Imperial Parliament, would not remove the main objections to the Bill. The Protestants of the North, he pointed out, were unanimously alarmed at the Bill, because they dreaded not so much legislation as unfair administration. The question of Ulster was the first difficulty, and the Conservative party would decline to give to the Roman Catholic majority a power over the Ulstermen which would be worse than any Coercion Act which had ever been passed. He expressed his readiness to accept as a definition of coercion, "restrictions upon the liberty of the subject in Ireland which do not exist in any other part of the United Kingdom." And he declared it the duty of a Government to apply this definition not only to individuals but to political organisations. "But," he added, "political organisations have their duties as well as their rights, and in return for the freedom which they enjoy they are bound to carry on their agitation for the objects which they desire by constitutional means. But if a political organisation in Great Britain were to seek to promote its objects by the use of intimidation followed by outrage, by interference with individual liberty, the law ought to deal very strictly with that organisation, and if it was not strong enough to deal with it it ought to be made strong enough to deal with it. And that, neither more nor less, is all that we mean by c



legislation for Ireland. We object to this measure because we believe it destroys the advantages of the Union and does not satisfy that national sentiment which the hon. member for Cork represents. He admitted that it did not satisfy that national sentiment as much as Grattan's Parliament did. If it does not satisfy that national sentiment, it cannot bring about that improved state of feeling between Great Britain and Ireland which has been the basis of the arguments of the supporters of the Bill." As for the opinion of the civilised world in support of the measure, to which Mr. Gladstone had appealed, Sir M. Hicks-Beach pointed out that there were several forms of foreign opinion, including those notoriously hostile to England; but he declared that the opinion of Great Britain in favour of the measure never had been pronounced, and if the constituencies were consulted would be given decidedly in condemnation of the policy of the Government.

Mr. Gladstone then rose to close the debate, and in a speech which for rhetorical power and finish compared favourably with some of even his greatest achievements, he sought to bring back to his side those Liberals who were still supposed to be wavering in their opinions. He commenced by expressing the pleasure with which he had listened to Mr. Cowen's singularly eloquent speech, and to Mr. Parnell's masterly exposition; and leaving that gentleman and Sir M. Hicks-Beach to settle between themselves their personal differences, he dealt summarily with Mr. Chamberlain's attitude towards the Bill, and his "statement of simple facts." "The right hon. gentleman," he added, "says that I announced that the Bill was not to be reconstructed. I announced nothing of the kind. I announced that I did not promise that it should be reconstructed. . . . I conceive that a person who has promised that a Bill shall be reconstructed is bound to reconstruct it. A person who has not so promised is free to reconstruct it, but is not bound to do so." Coming to the measure itself, the sole responsibility for which he indignantly disclaimed, he emphasised his previous statement that the question involved was simply the principle of the Bill as distinct from its particulars, all of which he said members were entirely free to oppose hereafter. They could, if they thought fit, displace the 24th or any other clause, and propose amendments which he pledged the Government to carefully consider. Discussing the action of the Unionists and their fears, he contended that it was the merest slang of vulgar tongues to describe the measure as a Separation Bill, and quoting numerous instances to show that apart from the intervention of a third power the grant of local independence had never been followed by severance, he insisted that the severance of the government of Ireland for local purposes only would be a mode of union rather than disunion.

Mr. Gladstone then reviewed at some length the various *historical* and contemporary examples of local independence,

insisting especially upon the case of Canada. Turning next to the condition of Ireland, he declared that its pressing needs were the reason why everything else had been put aside for the sake of Irish legislation. In a considerable portion of that country, he declared, distress was chronic, disaffection was perpetual, and insurrection was smouldering; and he added: "It is that you have not got that respect for the law, that sympathy with the law on the part of the people without which real civilisation cannot exist. That is our first reason. I will not go back at this time on the dreadful story of the Union; but that too must be unfolded in all its hideous features if this controversy is prolonged—that Union of which I ought to say that, without qualifying in the least any epithet I have used, I do not believe that Union can or ought to be repealed, for it has made marks upon history that cannot be effaced." Mr. Gladstone next touched upon the character of British legislation for Ireland since the Union, maintaining that the redress of Irish grievances was generally obtained under compulsion, whilst the bulk of the legislation for that country had ended in failure. Referring to the rival plans of Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Salisbury, he declared the former's to be totally and absolutely unavailable for the solution of the difficulty, the urgency of which Mr. Chamberlain himself had formerly felt. As for Lord Salisbury's policy, Mr. Gladstone maintained that, in spite of all explanation to the contrary, "the enabling the Government of England to govern Ireland was in reality coercion." He then turned to his own policy, and urged that no time could have been more favourable for inaugurating a new departure in our Irish policy. He urged the House in eloquent language to "recollect that this is the earliest moment in our Parliamentary history when we have the voice of Ireland authentically expressed in our hearing. Majorities of Home Rulers there may have been upon other occasions; a practical majority of Irish members never has been brought together for such a purpose. Now first we can understand her; now first we are able to deal with her; we are able to learn authentically what she wants and wishes, what she offers and will do; and as we ourselves enter into the strongest moral and honourable obligations by the steps we take in this House, so we have before us practically an Ireland under the representative system able to give us equally authentic information, able morally to convey to us the assurance that a breach and rupture would cover Ireland with disgrace. There is another reason, but not a very important one. It is this. I feel that any attempt to palter with the demands of Ireland so conveyed in forms known to the constitution and any rejection of the conciliatory policy might have an effect that none of us could wish in strengthening that party of disorder which is behind the back of the Irish representatives, which skulks in America, which skulks in Ireland, *which I trust is losing ground and is losing*

force, and will lose ground and will lose force in proportion as our policy is carried out, and which I cannot altogether dismiss from consideration when I take into view the consequences that might follow upon its rejection."

Since the mission of Lord Fitzwilliam in 1796, there had never been such a golden moment as the present to satisfy the hopes of Ireland and to do justice to the voice which Parliament had given to the people of that country. Mr. Gladstone concluded in the following eloquent words :—

" We do not undervalue or despise the forces opposed to us. I have described them as the forces of class and its dependents, and that as a general description—as a slight and rude outline of a description—is, I believe, perfectly true. I do not deny that many are against us whom we should have expected to be for us. I do not deny that some whom we see against us have caused us by their conscientious action the bitterest disappointment. But you have power, you have wealth, you have rank, you have station, you have organisation, you have the place of power. What have we? We think that we have the people's heart; we believe and we know we have the promise of the harvest of the future. As to the people's heart, you may dispute it, and dispute it with perfect sincerity. Let that matter make its own proof. As to the harvest of the future, I doubt if you have so much confidence, and I believe that there is in the breast of many a man who means to vote against us to-night a profound misgiving, approaching even to a deep conviction, that the end will be as we foresee and not as you—that the ebbing tide is with you and the flowing tide is with us. Ireland stands at your bar expectant, hopeful, almost suppliant. Her words are the words of truth and soberness. She asks a blessed oblivion of the past, and in that oblivion our interest is deeper than even hers. My right hon. friend Mr. Goschen asks us to-night to abide by the traditions of which we are the heirs. What traditions? By the Irish tradition? Go into the length and breadth of the world, ransack the literature of all countries, find, if you can, a single voice, a single book—find, I would almost say, as much as a single newspaper article, unless the product of the day, in which the conduct of England towards Ireland is anywhere treated except with profound and bitter condemnation. Are these the traditions by which we are exhorted to stand? No, they are a sad exception to the glory of our country. They are a broad and black blot upon the pages of its history, and what we want to do is to stand by the traditions in which we are the heirs in all matters except our relations to Ireland, and to make our relations to Ireland to conform to the other traditions of our country. So I have the demand of Ireland for what I call a blessed oblivion of the past. She asks also a boon for the future; and that boon for the future, unless we are much mistaken, will be a boon to us in respect of honour no less than a

boon to her in respect of happiness, prosperity, and peace. Such, Sir, is her prayer. Think, I beseech you, think well, think wisely, think not for a moment but for the years that are to come before you reject this Bill."

The division was taken immediately, Mr. Brand (Whig) and Mr. Caine (Radical) being named tellers for the Noes; and when the numbers were announced it was found that the Government was left in a minority of thirty, the numbers being, for the second reading 313, against 343. No fewer than 93 Liberals voted in the majority, showing the number of 'waverers' detached by Ministerial promises to have been less than was anticipated. In fact, from the time that the Government seemed to recognise the rejection of their Bill as possible, the hostile majority had been placed at something between six and twenty-five, and consequently the vote was even more decisive than had been anticipated. The Conservatives polled every supporter with the exception of two, one of whom was prevented by illness, and the other, Sir Robert Peel, by his divergence from the views of his party on the subject of Home Rule. Eight Liberals, in addition to three incapacitated by illness, absented themselves voluntarily from the division, of whom the most noteworthy was Captain O'Shea, whose election for Galway city "by command" of Mr. Parnell had been one of the most instructive episodes of the Nationalist campaign.

The division list, however, when analysed, and subtraction made of the Irish members, 85 Parnellites and 18 Conservatives, showed the following results:—

	Total.		For.		Against.		Absent.	
	L.	C.	L.	C.	L.	C.	L.	C.
England and Wales . . .	270	224	191	0	70	223	9	1
Scotland . . . . .	62	10	38	0	23	10	1	0
	<u>332</u> <u>234</u>		<u>229</u> <u>0</u>		<u>93</u> <u>233</u>		<u>10</u> <u>1</u>	
Totals . . . . .	566		229		326		11	

It was out of these figures that Mr. Gladstone would have to win 108 seats to insure him the majority necessary for his retention of office.

Before the Cabinet Council, which was hastily summoned, met and formally deliberated, a fresh dissolution was regarded as inevitable; and although it was said that two of its members were in favour of immediate resignation, the majority shared Mr. Gladstone's confidence that an appeal to the constituencies would endorse the cry of "Justice to Ireland."

To this meeting of the Cabinet Mr. Schnadhorst, the Secretary of the National Liberal Association, had been invited; and from his apparent acquaintance with the constituencies it was calculated that by the aid of the Irish vote, which at the previous election had been thrown on the Conservative side, a

least twenty-five English and Scotch seats would be won by the Ministerialists, and these, counting fifty in a division, would, with the Parnellite party, returning in at least equal strength, enable Mr. Gladstone to carry out his policy. The Conservatives, on the other hand, felt convinced that they would number at least 300 in the new Parliament, whilst the Unionists, supported by Conservative vote, would retain their seats.

The attitude which the Cabinet had decided to adopt was hinted at by Mr. J. Morley at the dinner of the Eighty Club (June 8) on the morrow of its defeat. He promised on behalf of his colleagues that they would not turn back from the task they had undertaken—namely, to convert the English and Scotch constituencies to the acceptance of Home Rule as the best, if not the only, solution of the Irish difficulty.

Defending the policy of the Government as against coercion, he said: "The more you prove to me that there is disorder and lawlessness in Ireland, the better evidence there is that you need our policy, that you cannot return to the policy which has produced that barbarous state of mind, temper, and habit which leads to these detestable crimes. Nobody knows better than I do that Ireland needs to be governed by a strong hand. Nobody has better means of knowing, nobody more frankly admits it, than I do; but if you wish to restrain those barbarous forces, if you wish to lead the Irish nation—or rather that portion of the nation which indulges in those practices—to a better mind, it will have to be done by Irish leaders."

On the question of the retention of the Irish members in the House of Commons, Mr. Morley added: "I wish you to realise this single fact, that wherever the English and Scotch majority combined on either side—Whig or Tory—is less than eighty-five, the Irish members would have in every detail of our business, large and small, the casting vote. You cannot pass a resolution, you cannot amend a clause, you cannot vote money for an expedition—you must dismiss or retain an administration—except at the goodwill and pleasure of the Irish members, unless your majority is over eighty-five, and the goodwill and pleasure of the Irish members will depend upon their contentment with your settlement."

When the two Houses reassembled after their short adjournment, Lord Kimberley in the Lords and Mr. Gladstone in the Commons announced (June 10) that the Queen had been advised to dissolve Parliament, and had accepted that advice. Mr. Gladstone, therefore, proposed that all contentious business should be abandoned, that the Appropriation Bill should be passed, and supplies granted on account sufficient to meet the requirements of the public service until Oct. 31. The precise date of the dissolution Mr. Gladstone would not undertake to give on that occasion, but it was understood that it would take place in the *last week of that month* (June), and that the new writs would be



returnable by the beginning of August or earlier. Sir M. Hicks-Beach was not altogether satisfied that, in the event of the result of the elections being undecisive, Mr. Gladstone would call Parliament together immediately after their conclusion. Mr. Gladstone, although disputing some of Sir M. Hicks-Beach's precedents, agreed if it were found that the Irish policy of the Government had been disapproved by the constituencies or any room for doubt remained, the new Parliament should reassemble forthwith.

In the course of the same sitting Lord Carnarvon in the House of Lords made a personal explanation with reference to Mr. Parnell's assertion on the last night of the debate on the Irish Bill in the Commons. He denied "plainly and broadly" that he had conveyed to him the intention of the Conservative Government to offer a statutory Parliament to Ireland with power to protect Irish industries. Towards the end of July 1885 he had agreed to meet Mr. Parnell in order to acquire information with regard to the feelings of the country, and the views and opinions of Mr. Parnell. In so doing he was not acting for the Cabinet nor authorised by them, nor did he communicate to them what he had done. Before the interview took place he laid down three conditions: "first, that I was acting of myself, by myself, and the responsibility was mine, and the communications were from me alone—that is, from my lips alone. Secondly, that the conversation was with reference to information only, and that it must be understood that there was no agreement, however shadowy, between us. And, thirdly, that I was there as the Queen's servant, and I would neither hear nor say one word that was inconsistent with the union of the countries. To these conditions Mr. Parnell consented." Lord Carnarvon added that, while favourable to limited self-government in Ireland, and anxiously desirous of a final settlement between the nations such as would satisfy real local requirements and to some extent national aspirations, he was not favourable to Mr. Gladstone's Bill, which settled nothing upon a lasting basis, and left open the great question which lay at the root of every other Irish question—the Land question.

The whole time of Parliament was now given up to closing the necessary business of the session, and many useful Bills which had made considerable progress, and had already been subjected to discussion in one or other of the two Houses, were ruthlessly sacrificed to the exigencies of an immediate dissolution. In the earlier part of the sittings after Easter the Archbishop of Canterbury had obtained the second reading (May 13) of his Bill to amend the law of Church patronage. Its object was to prevent advowsons being treated as mere pecuniary investments; to establish in each diocese a joint lay and ecclesiastical council which should have the supervision of all traffic in Church preferment within its *prescribed area*. The lay portion of the

would be nominated chiefly by the lord-lieutenant of the county, the chairmen of quarter sessions, and the church-wardens; the traffic in donatives would be restricted, and power would be given to the bishop to refuse to institute to a living a person whom two-thirds of the council might decide to be not a fit and proper person. The Bill was received with general approval, so far as it recognised the need of reform in which the law of presentation found itself. The Bill was then referred to a select committee, which referred it back (June 4), with amendments, but all further action was abandoned. A Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill, on the model of that proposed in the previous year by Lord Selborne, was brought in by the Lord Chancellor, read a second time (March 18), and passed through all its stages and sent to the Commons (April 15), where it was withdrawn (June 11) without any discussion being raised on its merits. A Bill "for extending the hours within which marriages may be lawfully solemnised" met with more success. Originally brought in by Mr. C. Williams (Jan. 22), it was read a second time (March 19), fixing the hour of 3 p.m. as that up to which marriages might be solemnised, and relieving registrars from compulsory attendance at marriages celebrated in dissenting chapels. In the House of Lords it was read a second time (April 6) without challenge, and after a few verbal alterations in committee it finally passed (May 6) and became law. On the other hand, the attempt to legalise marriage with a deceased wife's sister, brought in by the Duke of St. Albans, was opposed on its second reading (May 24) by the Duke of Argyll, and after a short debate was defeated by 149 to 127.

In the House of Commons Sir J. Pease moved (May 11) a resolution in favour of the abolition of capital punishment, which was opposed by Mr. Howard Vincent, Mr. F. Lockwood, Q.C., and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who, however, thought that the death penalty might be confined to cases where the intention to murder was clearly proved, but the resolution was ultimately negatived by 117 to 62. Among the measures having a social rather than a political object, the Infants Bill, the Shop Hours Regulation Bill, and the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors Bill were the most important. Of them, the first-named, brought in by the Attorney-General (Sir C. Russell), had for its object to confer on the mother the guardianship of her children on her husband's death, jointly with the guardians appointed by the father. An attempt to give the mother the sole guardianship was not received with favour, and the Bill was read a second time (April 2) without a division, and passed through the Commons (May 5). In the Lords it was subjected to very few alterations (May 21), which were accepted by the other House, and the Bill received royal assent (June 25). The Shop Hours Regulation Bill, originally brought in by Sir J. Lubbock, was read a second time (Feb. 15) and referred to a select committee, whence

it was brought back to the House (May 18), but was not taken into consideration for some time. Its main provision was to prevent children and young women being worked in shops for more than twelve hours a day; and in committee (June 17) Mr. Cooke obtained the insertion of two amendments, by one of which the hours of work from day to day should be notified in every shop, and by the other public-houses were included in the scope of the Bill. In the House of Lords an attempt on the part of the Earl of Wemyss (June 23) to defeat the Bill was negatived without a division, and with some slight amendments the Bill passed (June 23) and finally became law.

The champions of "Fair Trade," who, especially in Lancashire, had gained support for their views, were able to ventilate them in the House of Commons, but beyond raising an interesting debate they advanced the cause but little. Mr. Jennings, taking advantage of a private members' night (May 14), called attention to our fiscal system, and moved a resolution setting out the expediency of raising a larger portion of the revenue from import duties. In support of this proposal he gave numerous extracts from the Board of Trade returns and the evidence before the Trade Commission to illustrate the falling-off in our principal manufactures and the depression in the most important employments. The remedy he recommended was that import duties should be levied on certain descriptions of fully manufactured foreign goods entering into competition with similar goods of our own make; and that the revenue so obtained should be applied to the reduction of the duties on tea, coffee, and cocoa, and other burdensome imposts. Sir W. C. Brooks seconded the motion. Mr. Howell, who had given notice of an amendment that any proposal to revert to the policy of protection was misleading and mischievous in its tendency, and opposed to the best interests of the trade and commerce of the country, and injurious to the welfare of the working classes, quoted statistics copiously to connect the increase and decrease of exports and imports with periods of Liberal and Tory rule. The Chancellor of the Exchequer characterised the motion as protection pure and simple, and ridiculed the complaint that free trade had ruined our exports. The report of the Commission on Trade Depression was, in fact, a *vade mecum* of free trade. The people of this country were too much alive to the benefits which had been conferred on them by free trade to permit it to be reversed. Mr. E. Stanhope remarked that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's appreciation of the report justified the appointment of the Royal Commission by the late Government. As to the motion, he was personally favourable to extending the area of taxation, and thought also that if we had taxes on a few articles of importation it might give us weight and authority in dealing with foreign countries. But as to the general scope of the motion, he thought it too ambitious, and, seeing that the Royal Commission had not

yet reported, he advised its withdrawal. Sir J. McKenna made some remarks on the demonetisation of silver. Mr. V. Lloyd advocated a system which would impose equal taxation on the English and foreign workman. Mr. Hoyle bore testimony to the improvement in the condition of Lancashire operatives and Mr. Henniker Heaton showed that an experiment of protective duties in Victoria had been most successful in finding employment for workmen. The motion was then negatived without being pressed to a division.

Mr. Gladstone having on the defeat of his Irish Bill withdrawn all contentious business, the proceedings in Parliament were little more than formal, and it was only on the Bills relating to the expenses of Parliamentary elections that any attempt was made to carry a party policy. The most important of the Bills aimed at amending the Returning Officers Act 1875, as it was defined as making "better provision for appeals from judgments of county courts under that Act." This Bill, originally introduced (May 11) by Mr. T. Healy, met with but little attention in its earlier stages, and had been four times considered in committee, when the question was raised as to the amount of security to be required by the returning officer, and this was ultimately (June 10) fixed at 200*l*. On the following day the question of fees payable was debated at length, and at the close of the debate Mr. Labouchere carried, by 98 to 67, an instruction to the committee to provide the payment of the returning officers' expenses out of the rates. On reaching its second reading in the House of Lords (June 21) the Marquess of Salisbury objected both to the scale of returning officers' charges and to the provision for imposing them upon the local rates. His opposition would have been fatal to the whole Bill, and consequently Lord Kimberley on the part of the Government, which had taken charge of the Bill, consented to the omission of these provisions. The amendments made by the House of Lords were chiefly directed towards throwing upon the candidates the cost of elections, whilst the Radicals, led by Mr. Labouchere, were in favour of throwing all possible expenses upon the rates, in order to facilitate the entry to public life to poor men. They were, however, not able to carry their views, and the Bill ultimately passed, but without the amendments in this sense introduced at its latest stage into the Bill during its passage through the Commons. The companion measure for Ireland introduced by Mr. Taite was less successful. On the motion for its second reading (May 12), its promoter based his argument on the ground that the schedule of expenses chargeable by the returning officers allowed too large a margin. In recent elections in Ireland, he declared, the returning officers had struck off 50 per cent. of their charges rather than go into court. Polling booths which only cost five shillings each were charged three guineas each, and other expenses were augmented in similar proportion.

The schedule of reduced charges attached to the Bill would prove sufficient for the heaviest outlay that could be incurred. The Bill would also prevent the fraudulent contests that disgraced recent elections. Fifty elections in Ireland out of seventy-eight were contested for the purpose of putting candidates to needless expense. To meet these cases the Bill provided that a penalty should be put upon bogus candidates who only came forth and put real candidates to the unnecessary cost of a contested election. The second reading was carried by 174 to 56, but ultimately the Bill had to be dropped. Little else remained for discussion. The Indian Budget, explained by Mr. Stafford Howard (June 21), as usual provoked but languid interest, although the accounts showed a deficit of revenue (70,690,681*l.*) as compared with the expenditure (71,077,127*l.*) of 386,446*l.*, whilst there had been in the course of the year 1884-85 a further outlay of nearly five and a half million sterling on public works and the purchase of railways.

Before the House separated a report was received from the Select Committee on Parliamentary Procedure, to which the proposals laid on the table by the Conservative Ministry at the opening of the session had been referred. The original suggestions were considerably modified by the committee, over which Lord Hartington had presided, but the leading features of the proposed alterations were substantially maintained, especially in the matter of the "automatic closure of a debate." The committee recommended that the House should meet every Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, at three o'clock, and, unless previously adjourned, sit until half-past twelve o'clock at night, and no later; and that at seven o'clock the Speaker should leave the chair until nine o'clock. They also recommended that at midnight on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, and at half-past five o'clock on Wednesdays, the proceedings on any business then under consideration shall be interrupted, and a motion shall be made that the question then under consideration be put, which motion shall be decided without amendment or debate. If the motion, "That the question be now put," were resolved in the affirmative, the Speaker or chairman should forthwith put the question under consideration; but the question, "That the question be now put," should not be decided in the affirmative unless it were supported by a majority at least double the minority. The committee also recommended that several formalities observed at different stages of Bills should be dispensed with.

The report that the French naval officer commanding in the South Pacific had hoisted the French flag on the New Hebrides gave rise to a flutter of excitement, which was but half allayed by Mr. Bryce's statement (June 18) that the French Government had telegraphed to the Government of New Caledonia that if the hoisting had taken place it should be at once discontinued. The English Government, moreover, stated in distinct language that



France had given an assurance that she considered binding the engagement between the two countries relative to this group of islands.

At length the business of the session was brought to a close (June 25), but it was nearly six o'clock before the formalities could be concluded, and the Queen's speech delivered by commission, of which the following were the most important paragraphs:—

*“ My Lords and Gentlemen,*

*“ I have determined to release you from your high duties before the full accomplishment of the regular work of the session in order to ascertain the sense of my people upon the important proposal to establish a legislative body in Ireland for the management of Irish as distinguished from Imperial affairs.*

*“ With this view, it is my intention immediately to dissolve the present Parliament.*

*“ I have the satisfaction of acquainting you that the warlike operations of Servia against Bulgaria were, after a time, brought to a close through the wise counsels of the Powers and the forbearance of the Sultan; as also that after a period of anxiety the adoption of pacific counsels in Greece, and the disarmament now in progress under the orders of its Government, have removed a serious danger to the peace of the East of Europe.*

*“ The state of affairs in Egypt has improved, and I have been enabled materially to reduce my force in that country, and to bring it within the southern limits of Egypt proper.*

*“ I have concluded an arrangement with the Government of Spain which, if it should be adopted by the Cortes, will, I trust increase our commercial intercourse with that country, and will also encourage the importation of colonial wines.*

*“ I have felt a lively pleasure in promoting the Exhibition of the Products, Manufactures, and Arts of my Colonial and Indian Dominions, which is now being held in this metropolis. I feel that this enterprise, and the cordial interest in it which is exhibited by the people, at once prove the sympathy which unites the several portions of the Empire and powerfully tend to confirm and promote that sympathy.*

*“ It is with great satisfaction that I have given my assent to the Bill for amending the laws affecting the crofters of the Highlands, to the Bill for effecting important reforms in connection with the medical profession, and to the Bill for amending the law relating to the custody and guardianship of children.*

*“ I have given my consent to a Bill making such changes in the law of international copyright as are necessary to enable this country to enter the International Copyright Union contemplated by the convention about to be signed at Berne. In this Bill the opportunity has been taken of conferring on colonial and Indian authors the benefits of copyright, valid and uniform in every part of my dominions.”*

On the following day the shortest Parliament of the Queen's reign was dissolved; and the position in which the Prime Minister found himself was sympathetically described in the *Spectator*, which for so many years had followed with warm approval the phases of Mr. Gladstone's career: "His ablest colleagues alienated; his oldest friends dismayed; a Bill which was to tranquillise Ireland for ever lost; a Parliament rendered useless before it had actively lived; the Liberal party, 'the greatest instrument of progress ever constructed,' shattered to its foundation; the country filled with hostile passions; all enemies rejoicing, and all progress suspended--the moment that followed the division must have been a melancholy one for the proud old man, conscious of utter rectitude of purpose, and certain that his plan was only too farsighted for the clamouring multitude around. Take the view of his enemies, and he sat a consul deserted by his legions. Take the view of his most devoted follower, and still it must be bitter pain for a man to feel that the country he has ruled, and which only four months ago summoned him exultingly to the helm, cannot in a supreme hour rise to his own level of thought or show his own breadth of generosity."

## CHAPTER V.

The General Election—The Liberal Unionists—Mr. Gladstone's Address—Election Speeches and Manifestoes—Mr. Gladstone in Scotland—Lord Salisbury at Leeds—Mr. Morley and his Constituents—Mr. Gladstone at Manchester and Liverpool—Mr. John Bright's Speech to his Electors—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Balfour—The Elections—Liberal Losses in the Boroughs—Successes in the North—The County Contests—General Results—Mr. Gladstone Resigns—Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington—The New Ministry—Parliament Reassembles—Election of Speakers—Ministers at the Mansion House.

MR. GLADSTONE'S formal announcement of his intention to appeal from the verdict of the House to the constituencies permitted candidates to appeal finally to their electors, instead of obliging them to have recourse to speeches in Parliament. The situation was perhaps more complicated than any moment since the rejection of the first Reform Bill. The Prime Minister found himself at the head of 225 Liberals, exclusive of the Parnellites, whilst the Conservatives only numbered 250, exclusive of the Liberal Unionists. The latter party, however, exceeding the Home Rulers by ten or twelve votes, practically held the key of the position, so long as they preserved their alliance with their Conservative friends. The Unionists, however, laboured under the disadvantage of owing allegiance to two leaders, Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, whose rivalry and divergent ideas had at the previous election seemed to threaten the existence of the Liberal party. All the authority of Mr. Gladstone

and his moderating influence had been needed in the previous autumn to prevent the disagreement between the sectional leaders becoming fatal to the prestige of the Liberal party. The dangers of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy as well as certain personal feelings had brought into close co-operation the former opponents, and had brought about the defeat of the leader who had hitherto been their bond of union. The followers of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain were roughly estimated at about 100, of whom 93 had taken part in the recent division. Of these two-thirds were classified as Whigs or Hartingtonians, and the remaining one-third as Dissident Radicals. On the exact figures much dispute arose, for it was asserted that although 54 members had attended Mr. Chamberlain's private meeting (May 31), 22 of them really belonged to Lord Hartington's party, at which they also figured on the following day; but in so far as they voted in the majority against the Home Rule Bill, their especial shade of opposition was of secondary importance to the public. In any case the supporters of the Bill and its opponents would for the mass of the electors represent the two conflicting parties at the poll; and it was necessary to adopt such a course of action and such a tone of speech as would keep this issue plainly before the constituencies. The Conservative leaders on their side were not so sanguine of success as to suppose that they could gain the ninety seats requisite to give them a working majority in the House of Commons, and they, therefore, were the more disposed to come to an understanding with those Liberals by whose aid Mr. Gladstone's measure had been rejected. At a later stage a more definite understanding was arrived at between the allies. It was arranged that in no case should the Conservatives contest the seat of a Liberal Unionist, and in like manner that the Liberal Unionists should support the Conservatives against the Gladstonian Liberals and Home Rulers. This compact was fairly observed by the leaders of the parties; but, as will be seen, it was not always acted up to by the rank and file of the electors. The Ministerialists were by no means blind to the dangers which threatened them, but they found their action often paralysed by their previous utterances, or by the doubts of their constituents as to the complexion of their new allies. There was, moreover, another drawback against which the Ministerialists had to contend. The schism in the Liberal party had transferred to the Unionists the majority of the wealthy peers and county families who hitherto had supported the Liberal cause; and although by recent legislation election expenses had been greatly reduced, an election campaign throughout the country involved a large and inevitable expenditure, if conducted with any thoroughness.

The National Liberal Federation of Scotland was the first in the field (June 4) to urge upon Liberal associations their duty at such a crisis. In a strongly worded manifesto it said: "The

British people have to decide whether they will disregard the national sentiment of Ireland, and insist upon governing her, as heretofore, as a conquered country, against the will of the Irish people, or is Ireland to be awarded the position of a free, loyal, self-governing nation under the British Crown? Let not the Scottish people be led away by false issues. The question is purely one of national and civil right. Religion is being dragged into it for party purposes, and is thereby degraded. We earnestly call upon the Liberals of Scotland to stand by their great and venerable leader; and, now that an appeal to their suffrages is made, let them refuse to elect any candidate who declines to support this new departure in Irish politics."

Of the individual leaders, Mr. Chamberlain was the first to issue his address to his electors in West Birmingham (June 12), and, although regarded as somewhat too long for such an occasion, it was a vigorous attack upon the principle of Home Rule and upon the change of front shown by Mr. Gladstone. In the previous November the leader of the then united Liberal party had solemnly declared to be unsafe what he had now deliberately undertaken. He now proposed to create a rival Parliament in Dublin, which would be a constant source of irritation and agitation until the full demands of the Separatist party were satisfied. Such an arrangement would lead to a complete separation. The government of Ireland, independent of all external control, would be handed over to the representatives of the National League, and the Protestants of Ulster and elsewhere would be left to the tyranny of a hostile majority. Of all the classes ruined, the landlords alone were to be compensated at the cost of 150,000,000*l.* to the British taxpayer, "the most gigantic bribe ever offered to the opponents of any legislation." Mr. Chamberlain therefore resisted the Irish policy of the Government; and whilst refusing to admit that coercion was the only alternative, or that the enforcement of just laws could be properly described as coercion, he believed that a great measure of relief and benefit might be conferred on Ireland by the extension of its system of self-government. "Liberal Unionists, while determined in their opposition to the establishment of a separate Parliament for Ireland, are, nevertheless, anxious to meet, as far as possible, the legitimate aspirations of the Irish people, shared, as they believe them to be, by Scotland and by Wales, for greater independence in the management of their local affairs. In this connection the objects to be kept in view are: 1. To relieve the Imperial Parliament by devolution of Irish local business, and to set it free for other and more important work. 2. To secure the full representation of Irish opinion on all matters of purely Irish concern. 3. To offer to Irishmen a fair field for legitimate local ambition and patriotism, and to bring back the attention of the Irish people, now diverted to a barren conflict in the Imperial Parliament, to the practical consideration of their

own wants and necessities. And, lastly, by removing all unnecessary interference with Irish government on the part of Great Britain, to diminish the causes of irritation and the opportunity of collision. To secure these objects it will be expedient to establish a complete system of popular local government, alike in its main features for England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales."

Mr. Chamberlain, moreover, would not limit his local self-government to a purely municipal organisation; a larger scheme, involving delegation, not a surrender of power, would be found desirable, and he thought that, "subject to the concurrent and supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament, such an arrangement would satisfy the national aspirations of Scotland and Wales, as well as of Ireland." In conclusion, Mr. Chamberlain protested against the attempts made in certain Liberal quarters "to excommunicate all who are unable to repudiate in a few months the opinion and conviction of a lifetime."

Mr. Gladstone's address to the electors of Midlothian followed almost immediately (June 14). He began by blaming the previous Conservative Government (although a weak one), first, for not having closed the Irish controversy, with the help of the Liberal party; and next, for having placed the Irish question (by its coercion policy of Jan. 26) in the foreground, to the exclusion of every other. "The hour, as all felt, was come, and the only point remaining to determine was the manner in which it should be dealt with. In my judgment the proposal of coercion was not justified by the facts, and was doomed to a certain and disgraceful failure. Some method of governing Ireland other than coercion ought, as I thought, to be sought for, and might be found. I therefore viewed without regret the fall of the late Cabinet, and when summoned by her Majesty to form a new one, I undertook it on the basis of an anti-coercion policy, with the fullest explanation to those whose aid I sought as colleagues that I proposed to examine whether it might not be possible to grant to Ireland a domestic legislature, under conditions such as to maintain the honour and consolidate the unity of the Empire. Two clear, positive, intelligible plans are before the world. There is the plan of the Government, and there is the plan of Lord Salisbury. Our plan is that Ireland should, under well-considered conditions, transact her own affairs. His plan is to ask Parliament for new repressive laws, and to enforce them resolutely for twenty years, at the end of which time he assures us that Ireland will be fitted to accept any gifts in the way of local government or the repeal of coercion laws that you may wish to give her. I leave this daring project to speak for itself in its unadorned simplicity, and I turn to the proposed policy of the Government."

*With reference to the forces arrayed against him, Mr. Gladstone said:—*



Our opponents, gentlemen, whether Tories or Seceders, have used the name of Unionist. I deny their title to it. In Ireland, indeed, we are all Unionist alike, but the Union which they refuse to modify is, in its present shape, a paper Union obtained by force and fraud, and never sanctioned or accepted by any Irish nation. They are not Unionist. A true Union is to be based on the sentiments of the human beings united. Tried by this criterion, we have less union between Great Britain and Ireland now than we had under the settlement of 1782."

Although her lawful representatives Ireland demanded a revival of a national legislative assembly, whilst recognising that "the Union, law as it was obtained, cannot, and ought not to be repealed." Gladstone was prepared to indorse this appeal on the ground of the benefits which Irish autonomy would confer. These, as he went on to explain, might be thus summarised: the consolidation of the unity of the Empire, and a great addition to its strength; the stoppage of a heavy, constant, and demoralising drain of public treasure; the abatement and gradual extinction of the ancient feuds in Ireland, and the development of her resources, which experience shows to be the natural consequence of free and orderly government; the redemption of the honour of Great Britain from a stigma fastened upon her almost from time immemorial in respect to Ireland by the judgment of the whole civilised world; and, lastly, the restoration to Parliament of its vigour and efficiency, and the regular progress of the business of the country.

Lord Salisbury's position as a peer of Parliament, although it precluded him from intervening directly in Parliamentary contests, did not prevent him from taking advantage of the visit of a Conservative Association to Hatfield (June 12) to defend himself and his Government from Mr. Gladstone's attacks. "We were," he said, "hardly recovering from the sensation of the unjust and most indefensible accusations of our opponents that we were in favour of Home Rule, when we suddenly discovered that all the time the men who had been flinging these aspersions at our heads were themselves conspiring for that end. We suddenly discovered that Mr. Gladstone, in the secrecy of his study, while he was deluding the public by ambiguous phrases his friends and foes alike, was maturing his plans for the disintegration of the British Empire, and for bringing its political condition to an extent which the wildest visionary has not dreamt of up to this time."

Lord Salisbury then went on to explain what the integrity of the Empire meant, what danger its disintegration, as in handing over the executive government of Ireland to the Nationalists, would involve. If it was Canada or Australia the matter might be different; those countries were many thousands of miles from our shores and we were good friends with the people, but with Ireland, which was at our very door, the case was very different. *time when you are asked to give the executive power into*

their hands you are practically asked to place at their mercy all the minority, all the loyalists, all the industrious, commercial and progressive part of the community. At the time when you are asked to place in their hands a power which will make them military masters of the island of Ireland, at that time a minister of the Crown can speak of a large proportion of the people hating us. Is it not madness at such a moment to give such a weapon into their hands? However much you may be willing to recognise their good qualities, however much you may desire to improve their condition, still when you know that a large proportion of them hate us, when you know that it is not a sentiment of to-day, but that it has been rising up year after year and generation after generation for a long time past, when also you know that the measures—the so-called remedial measures adopted by Mr. Gladstone have only exasperated and increased that hatred—when you know all this, is it not madness to assume that their feeling will turn in a day, and they will forget in a moment all that they have thought and felt in the past, and to give unreservedly into their hands the fate of your friends and the power and integrity of the Empire? It is really now for the people of this island to decide whether they will make this terrible experiment and run this enormous risk. I believe that their answer will be the same as the answer of their representatives in the House of Commons. I believe that in the country as in the House of Commons, by the union of men who, despite of party and rising above party, have combined together to support interests far superior to any of those over which we have party struggles—that by the combination we shall be enabled to return a good answer to the question that has been put to the country, and that the union of all patriotic men will preserve our united Empire.”

On the other side, Earl Spencer, addressing a meeting at Chester (June 16), defended the Government proposals with regard to Ireland. “Mr. Gladstone,” he said, “had done right in dissolving Parliament. If his policy was right let it be carried out once, and if it was wrong let other men take the responsibility of governing England and Ireland. It had become necessary for the Liberal party to say whether they were prepared to revert to the old policy of alternate coercion and remedial legislation. From his own knowledge of Ireland he could say that in the past however successful these attempts might have been to restore law and order, the feelings of Ireland against England were always more bitter after these laws had been successfully put in force than they were before. Were they to persevere in this old policy of coercion? Mr. Gladstone had said he could not adopt this policy; that his policy was one of reliance on the Irish people. There was some indication of another policy in a speech of Lord Salisbury’s; but did Lord Salisbury expect that if he proposed to govern Ireland resolutely without the aid of the Irish party he

could do so under the ordinary law? He knew full well he could not. As for Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, it would not be accepted in Ireland, but if it were it would create greater difficulties than Mr. Gladstone's plan. He believed the land question could not be settled without giving Home Rule, but that Home Rule would not pacify Ireland unless some solution of the land question was found.

Lord Hartington's manifesto (June 17) erred, like that of Mr. Chamberlain's, on the score of length. Equally with his colleague he denied that Home Rule had been included in the programme of 1885, and regretted that, "if it is now the deliberate opinion of Mr. Gladstone that the difficulties of the government of Ireland can only be solved by a fundamental alteration of the relations of the two countries," he did not place his view before the constituencies before an irrevocable step was taken. The plan adopted did not satisfy the conditions Mr. Gladstone himself laid down, and "we have no assurance that it will be reconstructed." Lord Hartington denied that justice was involved in the matter. It would be, if the claim of Ireland were for separation; but to require that the people of Ireland should submit to be governed by a Parliament in which they were fully represented might be inexpedient, but could not be unjust. The claim to self-government within safe limits was, however, reasonable, the question being the limits of safety. Mr. Gladstone's Bill went far beyond those limits, granting as it did the control and administration of laws affecting the relations of property, the punishment of crime, and the civil and religious liberties of the whole community. He therefore resisted the Bill, especially as it would hand over the minority to a Government which they regard as menacing to their liberties and property.

Lord Hartington then went on to show that Mr. Gladstone had apparently abandoned the landlords, and was silent about Ulster. He suggested as an alternative plan that statutory bodies strictly controlled by Parliament should manage strictly local affairs, and believed that if the majority of the United Kingdom declared that they would concede no more, the Irish people would not be persuaded to continue a hopeless and unnecessary contest. Mr. Gladstone's scheme was no alternative to coercion, for it was certain that without coercion the Protestants of Ulster would not submit, and, indeed, coercion was more fairly attributed to the National League. "It is the earnest desire and hope of every section of the Liberal party that in Ireland and all other parts of her Majesty's dominions, the law may be enforced by the same methods and the same institutions. But the enforcement of a just law is the duty of Government." Resistance to such a law could not be justified. To the question of how England and Scotland are to be governed, Lord Hartington furnished the following reply: "The full and equal representation in Parliament which has been freely conceded to the Irish

people must be conditional on their exercise of these privileges in a manner compatible with the efficiency, the dignity, and even the existence of Parliamentary institutions. A manifest determination to destroy and to cripple those institutions would be as clearly rebellion against our constitution as open resistance to the Crown; and it would be our duty to defend the authority of Parliament against internal attacks, as our predecessors have defended it from the external aggression of arbitrary power."

To complete the series of these addresses, that of Mr. Goschen to the electors of East Edinburgh attracted special notice by the clearness with which he stated his position. "I object," he said, "to the establishment of an entirely separate executive in Ireland responsible not to the Parliament at Westminster, but to a Parliament in Dublin. These objections I should hold in respect of any portion of the United Kingdom. But in the case of Ireland I especially object to the withdrawal of the control of the police and the administration of justice from the impartial hands of the Imperial executive. And I do so, not, as has been unjustly alleged, because I believe in any innate disqualification of the Irish people for the management of their own affairs, but because long-standing differences of race and creed and class have produced a situation too difficult for the untried and partisan authorities to whom the measure of the Government would hand over exclusive and unrestricted power. I hold that the Imperial Parliament is not justified in handing over a minority amounting to nearly one-third of the people of Ireland to a rule against which they passionately protest, and from which they are deeply convinced that they have to fear injury to their deepest interests. . . . No analogy from autonomy granted to homogeneous populations can be fairly applied to a case where an important part of the people, including some of its best energies, prefer the Imperial connection to a Home Rule which would be a foreign rule to them. . . . Justice to Ireland must not mean injustice to one-third of her population." Mr. Goschen retorted Mr. Gladstone's accusation that he was for a "paper Union" by saying that Mr. Gladstone is for a supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, but that it is a mere paper supremacy. And, while "sorrowfully admitting" that the offer made to the Nationalists had added most seriously to the difficulties of the task imposed on us, he requested his constituents to return him to the new House to represent the conviction that "the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, which is the real issue at stake," "is the affair, not of any party nor of any class, but of the nation at large."

So far the Conservative leaders had remained silent, and in this respect gave ground for the charge brought against them, that in the constituencies, as in Parliament, they were ready to allow their new allies to bear the brunt of the battle. Obviously

the Unionists, in dissociating themselves from the Liberal party, found it necessary to defend their course of action, but as in all probability the Conservatives would in any change of Government claim their full share of representation, it was felt that they should also bear their share in the labour of the contest. To popularise and extend their principles, especially in those districts where the National Liberal Association was strongest, Mr. Chamberlain and the seceders from that body founded a new Radical Union, of which the headquarters were fixed at Birmingham; the elder society having transferred its centre of activity to Leeds, and to the National Liberal Club in London. In an inaugural address (June 17) Mr. Chamberlain ridiculed the charge of inconsistency brought against the Unionists by a Government which changed its mind as to the details of its great measure every twenty-four hours; which first declared Irish members inadmissible to Parliament, and then provided for their "spasmodic" admission; which had declared the Purchase Bill an integral portion of its scheme, and then silently dropped it; which gave Ireland the control of her Customs, and then took it away. "I defy the sworn advocates of the Bill to say what it is at the present moment." Unity, he maintained, could only be secured through the absolute supremacy of one Parliament, and that depended on the full and continuous representation of all three kingdoms. His own policy was to maintain that supremacy, whilst delegating certain powers hereafter to be defined. The Canadian Constitution furnished the basis of a plan, especially as it allowed the entire control of criminal law and justice to remain with the central power; but Mr. Chamberlain was careful to say that the Provincial Legislatures of Canada had both too much and too little power. He would meet the argument that Irishmen would reject such a proposal by saying that we could not know that, as the offer had never been made, and that we must not take the opinion of the American Irish, who desired only separation, to be the opinion of the Irish people at home. If we yielded to the former, we surrendered not to the claim of justice, but to the fear of dynamite.

Mr. Gladstone's departure for Scotland (June 17) was marked by a display of that enthusiasm which on several previous occasions had sped him on similar journeys. Selecting on this occasion the route by the Midlands, he was everywhere welcomed by crowds of well-wishers, whose presence and cheering proved that the Prime Minister had lost among the masses nothing of his former popularity. At St. Pancras, Leicester, Trent Junction, and Normanton stations he addressed a few words to those assembled, urging upon them in slightly different terms that the one great question which the electors had now to determine was whether Ireland should be governed by love and confidence or by force. At Hawick, on the Scotch border, at Melrose and at Galashiels, the evidence of popular devotion to Mr. Gladstone



was still more remarkable; and on his arrival at Edinburgh there was nothing to suggest that his popularity was on the wane. It was, therefore, hoped by his supporters, and expected by his opponents, that by his addresses to his constituents he would be able to stimulate among Liberals of all shades a heartier approval of his measures than they had received in Parliament, and that he would furnish the watchword by which the way to the conscience of the electorate might be reached.

Before, however, passing to these two speeches, reference should be made to Mr. Bright's address to his constituents of the Central Division of Birmingham, and to Lord Salisbury's defence of the Conservative position before a large meeting at Leeds. Mr. Bright declined to pledge himself even to the "principle" of the Home Rule Bill, on the ground that it might be innocent or most dangerous according as it should be explained or insisted on in future Bills. "I cannot give any such pledge. The experience of the past three months does not increase my confidence in the wisdom of the Administration or of their policy with respect to the future Government of Ireland. We have before us a principle which is not explained by its authors or its supporters. I will not pledge myself to what I do not understand, or what I cannot approve." Mr. Bright firmly disapproved the existence of two legislative assemblies in the United Kingdom, believing that "no Irish Parliament can be as powerful and as just in Ireland as the United Parliament sitting in Westminster." "My six years' experience of the Irish party, of their language in the House of Commons, and of their deeds in Ireland makes it impossible for me to consent to hand over to them the property and the rights of four millions of the Queen's subjects, our countrymen in Ireland. At least two millions of them are as loyal as the population of your town, and I will be no party to a measure which will thrust them from the generosity and justice of the United and Imperial Parliament." Moreover, not satisfied with the effect his unopposed return at Birmingham might have upon the public mind, Mr. Bright addressed to Mr. Caine, the most active of the Radical Unionists, a letter which, although referring only to that gentleman's candidature, was quoted far and wide as the expression of opinion of one of the oldest and most consistent Radical statesmen of the day.

"One Ash, Rochdale, June 22, 1886.

"DEAR MR. CAINE,—I see you are engaged in a fight at Barrow. I much hope you will win. It is not pleasant to see how unforgiving some of our heretofore Liberal friends are if their representatives refuse to surrender judgment and conscience to the demands or the sudden changes of their political leader. The action of our clubs and associations is rapidly engaged in making delegates of their members, and in insisting on their forgetting all principles if the interests of a party or the leader of

party are supposed to be at stake. What will be the value of party when its whole power is laid at the disposal of a leader from whose authority no appeal is allowed? At this moment it is notorious that scores of members of the House of Commons have voted with the Government who in private have condemned the Irish Bills. Is it wise for a Liberal elector or constituency to prefer such a member, abject at the feet of a Minister, to one who takes the course dictated by his conscience and his sense of honour? But we need not despair. The ninety-three who voted in the majority have done much to redeem the Liberals from the discredit of accepting a measure which the majority of them condemned. I hope the good people of Barrow will sustain you in your honest course.—Believe me, yours sincerely,

“JOHN BRIGHT.”

Lord Salisbury, in his speech at Leeds (June 18), referring to the reiterated charge brought against him that he had advocated twenty years of repression in Ireland, asserted that he had not recommended that anything should be made punishable except murders, robberies and mutilation, and proved breakers of the criminal law. “To compare that coercion,” he added, “with Mr. Gladstone’s coercion when he imprisoned a thousand men without trial for a political object, is to juggle with words. We have not recommended political coercion.” He denied absolutely that the Conservative Cabinet ever entertained a proposal for the constitution of an Irish Legislature, or ever told Mr. Parnell they did. With regard to the emigration scheme, he had wished to assist willing emigrants, and he was ready to grant local self-government to Ireland; but the statutory bodies should only be permitted to pass by-laws, not to enact laws.

Mr. Gladstone thus had in the speeches of his opponents an almost unlimited number of arguments to refute, and of objections to remove; and it was hoped that he would address himself more directly to them, and to the difficulties with which his Bills had been found surrounded. In this respect, however, his followers and hearers were alike disappointed. In his first speech, delivered at the Edinburgh Music Hall (June 18), Mr. Gladstone began by asserting that there were no judges so competent to deal with questions of policy and broad principles of justice as the electors of the nation. What was now before the country was the establishment of a legislative body in Ireland for the management of exclusively Irish affairs. After referring to the attitude of the *Scotsman*, Mr. Gladstone continued: “The principle has been stated over and over again, and I have stated to you now, and I tell you this, it is idle to say that the country is to be asked to vote upon the principle of the Ministerial Bill. The Ministerial Bill is dead. The principle of that Bill survives. I certainly will never be guilty of the dishonesty of promising you, without due consideration, a new plan for giving effect”

that principle. I never will accept a new plan unless it be that it is better than the old one. I tell you, in the first place—I must tell you—that I have been grievously disappointed with the barrenness and stolidity of mind shown by the critics of our plan. . . . Perhaps, when they come again to Parliament, or such of them as get there, they will produce one or more excellent plans.” Mr. Gladstone promised to cast his own Bill to the winds as soon as a better way of giving effect to his views could be produced. As for the rival Carnarvon-Parnell, Hartington, and Chamberlain schemes, he dismissed them with a few contemptuous words, as “unreal, halting, stumbling, ever-shifting, ever-vanishing” alternatives. The only rival policy to his own he declared to be Lord Salisbury’s policy of coercion. “Two hundred and fifty Tories are at the back of Lord Salisbury; 310 or 320 Liberals, at any rate, are at our backs. With these, our two real policies, you may convert the 250 if you like into 350 or 400; you may reduce our 310 or 320 to 250 or 200—that is all, gentlemen, in your power. But reflect in the name of Almighty God, in the sanctuary of the chamber, in the sanctuary of your heart and of your soul, reflect what it is, in this year of 1886, after nearly a century of almost continual coercion, becoming weaker, more and more odious, less and less effective as we go along, and repudiated now by the large majority of your representatives—reflect what it is to propose this and only this as an alternative to the policy of local government for Ireland. It is for you to consider it for yourselves, if there are Conservatives among you, to consider for yourselves what you have to do, and to consider what it is you have to answer. Do not allow yourselves to be led away by craven fear. Have some belief that, acting strongly, you will act justly. Justice is always strong. Join us in the effort to close the painful, the terrible, the awful chapter in the relations between England and Ireland, which for centuries and centuries have been an opprobrium in the eyes and judgment of the world. Join us in that happy, I may almost say that holy effort, and rely upon it that if we attain the object in view we shall have done more for the honour of Great Britain than for the happiness of Ireland.”

In his second speech (June 21) Mr. Gladstone travelled over much the same ground, enforcing his appeals by fresh metaphors and old arguments. Referring to the disruption of the Liberal party, he said that the seceders formed a very small group, and that it was they who had abandoned the traditions of the party. He repeated his assertion that the so-called Unionist Liberals were paper Unionists, and that the Union they recommended was brought about by fraud and force. He referred also to Mr. Goschen’s statement that a long purse must be provided in order to run as many candidates as possible. The meeting at which that was said was a meeting of wealthy seceding Liberals. They *knew* the Liberals had lost all, or nearly all, the wealthy

members of their party, and he strongly objected to this principle of wealth being thrown in the scale to keep good but poor men out of Parliament. Mr. Goschen was, no doubt, a good Liberal in his heart, but he had for years been a persistent opponent of Liberal progress. He would make an excellent Conservative, and Mr. Gladstone indirectly recommended him to the suffrages of a constituency hostile to Liberalism. Coming then to the question of the Land Bill, Mr. Gladstone quoted from a letter he had lately written to a friend, and described the following extract as "a not unfair statement of the case" as it now stands: "What I take to be the case is that both our Bills are for the moment dead. One carries on its tombstone the accorded sanction of a large minority of the House of Commons, so far as its principle is concerned. The other had no sanction beyond that of the Cabinet, and if the verdict of the constituencies be not favourable, we shall be dead also together with our Bills. Only one survival, I think, is certain, and that is the survival of the principle and policy of self-government for Ireland. For candidates this proposition leaves absolute freedom as to the means for giving effect to the self-government of Ireland, and, of course, as to the question of land purchase. As for us, you will find, if you have the patience to read my speech, that the declarations contained in it have reference to the time when it was spoken. Our offer was inseparable in our minds from the principle, but though it was inseparable at the moment, Parliament was not bound to join the Bills together, and I stated for myself and for the Government that the acceptance or rejection of our offer evidently must have an important influence on the future course of the question." He admitted that the Land Bill, which had been introduced with the hope that it would mitigate the bitterness and avoid the prolongation of a formidable political controversy, had not met with the support they had expected, and, after quoting the letter given above, said: "You will see, therefore, gentlemen, that, with regard to that and other particulars of our plan, we are at perfect freedom to consult for the benefit of the country, and to find the best and safest means of attaining our object—namely, the establishment of self-government in Ireland for Irish affairs, with perfect security for the fabric of Imperial unity. That is the principle, and that is the sole principle, which ought to guide us in our future deliberations; and our policy on every point as to the choice of means will receive its inspiration from that source, and from that source alone. We shall be as anxious as ever to maintain the obligation of honour and policy, and if we continue in the Government, which it is for you and other constituencies to decide—if we continue in the Government, it will be on that basis alone that our counsels will be founded."

Mr. Gladstone's third speech, delivered at Glasgow (June 22), was obviously intended to allay the fears for their Irish co-religionists which had taken hold of the Scotch Presbyterians.

Opening his speech with a remark of Dr. Chalmers's eulogistic of Irish character, Mr. Gladstone admitted that the Government could think of no new security for Ulster, and that they adopted Mr. Parnell's view on that head. But he utterly disbelieved that any religious persecution in Ireland would result from Home Rule. He declined, moreover, to admit that the story of the Scotch Union furnished any evidence in favour of the Irish Union, Scotland having practically always got what in reason it wanted through the Imperial Parliament. He further conveyed the idea that the promise given at the meeting at the Foreign Office to bring back Irish representatives to discuss Imperial affairs would be redeemed, but so redeemed "as not to interfere with the freedom of the Irish Legislature, nor with the dignity, order, and independence of the English."

After delivering this speech, Mr. Gladstone immediately left Scotland for Hawarden, profiting by the halt of the train at Carlisle to make a spirited attack on the Unionists and their candidate, Mr. Ferguson, who, after its delivery, declined to contest the seat. Mr. Gladstone's Midlothian campaign was not in other respects successful. He had confused rather than cleared the issues before the electors; and he had scarcely attempted to deal with the serious arguments brought against the working of his Irish policy. He urged its acceptance by the electors as a matter rather of justice, duty, and expediency than as if he believed its application by the Irish themselves would at all events relieve England from the responsibility of which he thought the latter country heartily weary.

Simultaneously with his leader, Mr. John Morley was defending the Irish policy of the Government. In his first speech at Bradford (June 19), which bristled with epigrams, the Chief Secretary declared that neither the Home Rule nor the Land Purchase Bills were dead, but only sleeping, and would be revived. The criticism of their details had been prompted by hatred of their principles. Home Rule he pronounced indispensable for England, because without it we should have the Irish for our enemies in the event of foreign war or domestic disaster; and equally indispensable for Ireland because Irishmen would never get rid of their economic fallacies until they were face to face with the consequences. If they wished for separation it was because of the bad system under which they had been governed by England. Mr. Morley paid a glowing tribute to the Irish people. "I, for one," he said, "have long had a high appreciation of the great qualities of the Irish people. They are called idle, restless, discontented. Idle? The Irish people have done the greatest part of the hard work of the world. Idle, when the Irish peasants and generations of Irish peasants have reclaimed the land, the harsh, thankless land of the bog and the mountain side, have reclaimed that land knowing that the fruit of their *labour* would be confiscated in the shape of rent? And the



Irish have piety, they have reverence, and they have had—and they had only too much—docility. They know how to follow leaders, and I am persuaded that there is in Ireland all the material out of which, with time, freedom, and responsibility, you may build a solid nation worthy to take its place among the other nations that have the British flag waving over them.” He expressed his entire disbelief in the assertion that, with Ireland set free, the violent section would or could govern the Constitutional section, for it was the only one system which gave the extreme men their strength; and he thought the ruling party in Ireland would stand between England and the extremists. He rejected Lord Salisbury’s plans, because local self-government, if honest, would do more harm than good; and Mr. Chamberlain’s plans, because he did not believe that what might suit England or Scotland or Wales would suit Ireland. Her case demanded special treatment. The only course was to give Ireland the system she wanted, the only system which her leaders and people would consent to work.

In addressing his own electors at Newcastle-on-Tyne (June 21), Mr. Morley was even more emphatic. He pronounced himself strongly in favour of both Bills, and, with regard to the Land Purchase Bill, he made use of significant language, which was said to indicate a divergence between himself and some of his colleagues. “We are asked,” he said, “why, if we had accepted it as our principle that the Irish are to manage their own affairs, we do not leave them to settle the land question at their own will. There was a very good reason why we did not leave them, and why I for one will never be a party to leaving them to settle the Irish land question without our having a voice in the matter. The reason was that the land system of Ireland—one of the very vilest and most monstrous that was ever seen on the face of the earth—was planted there by us; it was by our own legislation, so near our own time as 1870 and 1881, that the conditions of land tenure in Ireland and that land-ownership in Ireland were fixed, and that legislation and the history of our dealings with the Irish landlords have imposed upon this country and upon the Parliament at Westminster responsibilities of which we could not, and never shall, be able to divest ourselves. That legislation has made the Irish question as much an English affair as an Irish affair, and it was on that ground among others that we did not leave the Irish land question to be settled by the Irish Parliament. There are other reasons why no native Irish Government can settle the land question of that country without our aid. I am not going into that now. I shall have thirteen or fourteen opportunities of talking to you about Ireland before we come to the day of the poll; but when we are told it is an astonishing and a monstrous thing that the Irish landlords, according to our scheme, were to be protected at the cost and risk of the British taxpayer, there is a question I should like to

ask. Do you think that the Irish landlords now entail no cost and no risk upon the British taxpayer? Why, we keep up our system in Ireland in order to secure, as we are bound to secure, to the Irish landlord that he shall have his legal rights as well as any other subject of her Majesty the Queen. Do they suppose that we run no risk to the taxpayers now from the Irish landlords and the Irish system? No! we run enormous risks, and no Government, whether Liberal or Tory, that touches the Irish question can go far in their task without touching the land question."

Mr. Morley then went on to argue that Home Rule was unavoidable, because Ireland needed strong government, and the British neither could nor would give strong government, because the demoralised habits, which he did not deny, of parts of Ireland had been acquired under our system of rule; and because the Irish Government must be national, must be fully responsible, and must possess "a large and liberal measure of power," commensurate with the responsibility placed upon it. The principles of the Bill met the difficulties, and no other principles would. No separate plan for Ulster could be just, for it must place the 400,000 Catholics of the province under the 600,000 Protestants. He doubted the possibility of inventing a scheme for the full and continuous representation of Ireland in Westminster, and denounced the English plan of local self-government as unworkable. If Kerry was treated as Northumberland, Kerry must control her police; and if Kerry controlled her police, there was an end to law and order.

Earl Spencer, speaking at Bristol (June 23), fully indorsed all that Mr. Morley had said with regard to the condition of the two Government Bills and the actual position of the Land Purchase Bill; and he explained at some length with great frankness the reason which had induced the Government to advocate a Home Rule policy. He said that the English people and Government had been under a delusion as to the real feeling of the Irish people, from which the last election had delivered them. Why was it that, instead of a people supporting the law as that which protected their lives and all their interests, they sympathised with those who attacked and opposed the law? It was because we had neglected to consider sufficiently their national aspirations for self-government. We had been under a delusion as to the opinions of the Irish people. We had thought there was a large minority representing those who favoured English opinion in Ireland; but the delusion very soon ceased. They were awakened in 1874, and still more in 1880, and fully awakened at the election last year. He was not ashamed that he now held different views from what he had held regarding Ireland; but, though he hoped that measures of conciliation and justice would win over the Irish people to English rule, he felt in the spring of last year that we had arrived at a time when, if *that measure failed*, the only thing to be tried was Home Rule.

Mr. Gladstone's policy was the only policy worthy of a generous and liberty-loving people. He did not believe that any danger would arise to the Protestants from an Irish Parliament, for during all his residence in Ireland not one single instance of intolerance on the part of Roman Catholics towards Protestants had come to his knowledge. They had heard that the Bills of the Government were dead. Lord Salisbury said it at Leeds the same night that Mr. Gladstone said it at Edinburgh. Now, as far as he knew, no Bill which had been defeated in the House of Commons, which had been withdrawn, or which could not be carried on in consequence of the dissolution or prorogation of Parliament, could be said to be kept alive—it must die; but what he thought was clear was that the general main principles of the Bills were kept alive. Those in the House of Commons who voted for the second reading of the Bill voted for the general principles of the Bill; but they did not bind themselves to details of clauses in Committee. For his part he maintained that the general principles of Mr. Gladstone's policy were yet alive, and that Mr. Gladstone and the Government were ready to consider every suggestion for amending their schemes. Not the least important part of the Government policy was their desire to settle the land question in Ireland. He wished his hearers to believe that it was not a mere question of bribe or gift to the Irish landlords. The Irish landlords' rights must be considered more or less like the rights of every other class in the country, but not more in any degree nor less than the rights of every other class. But he did not think that it was of enormous importance to settle, if possible, at the same time as they settled the other question, this land question which had disturbed Ireland for so long. He believed it could be settled without any cost or risk to the British taxpayer. He believed that, just as easily as building societies gave to artisans and others opportunities of possessing the houses in which they lived, so might a plan be produced for giving the Irish occupiers the ownership of their land, and the possession of their farms would promote thrift and independence among them, and, moreover, it would bring peace and order to the country.

Lord Randolph Churchill's address to the electors of South Paddington was couched in very different tones, and was devoted almost exclusively to personal attacks upon Mr. Gladstone. To many, even of his own party, Lord R. Churchill's language gave pain and annoyance; but the result showed, not only in his own constituency, that he had not altogether misjudged the virulence of the dislike with which Mr. Gladstone was regarded by a section of the electorate. His address began:—

“GENTLEMEN,—A ‘people's dissolution’ has come upon us. Such is the title given by Mr. Gladstone to the most wanton political convulsion which has, in our times, afflicted our country. The caprice of an individual is elevated to the dignity of an act.

of the people by the boundless egoism of the Prime Minister. The United Kingdom is to be disunited for the purpose of securing in office, if only for a little while, by the aid of a disloyal faction subsisting on foreign gold, a Government deserted by all who could confer upon it character or reputation.

“Mr. Gladstone has reserved for his closing days a conspiracy against the honour of Britain and the welfare of Ireland more startlingly base and nefarious than any of those other numerous designs and plots which, during the last quarter of a century have occupied his imagination. Nor are the results of the repeal of the Union, whatever they may be, a matter of moment to him. No practical responsibility for those results will fall upon his shoulders. He regards with the utmost unconcern and with inconceivable frivolity the fact that upon those who come after him will devolve the impossible labour of rebuilding the shattered Empire, of reuniting a divided kingdom. Let the credulous electorate give him, for the third time, a Parliamentary majority by the aid of which another Irish revolution may be consummated, and this most moderate of Ministers will be satisfied, will complacently retire to that repose from which he tells us ‘nature cries aloud’—nature to whose cries he has for so long turned a stone-deaf ear.” After analysing in his own fashion the “monstrous mixture of imbecility, extravagance, and political hysterics, better known as ‘the Bill for the future Government of Ireland,’” Lord R. Churchill declared that “the united and concentrated genius of Bedlam and Colney Hatch would strive in vain to produce a more striking tissue of absurdities.” “For the sake of this fifth message of peace, this farrago of superlative nonsense . . . all useful and desired reforms are to be indefinitely postponed, the British Constitution is to be torn up, the Liberal party shivered into fragments. . . . And why . . . To gratify the ambition of an old man in a hurry.” He then went on to attribute the present crisis to the “one-man power,” under which “trade has gone from bad to worse, Parliament has become demoralised, foreign credit shaken, the colonies alienated, and the Indian Empire imperilled.”

“What frightful and irreparable Imperial catastrophe is necessary to tear the British people from the influence of this fetish, this idol, this superstition, which has brought upon them and upon the Irish unnumbered woes? . . . Known to the country under various ‘aliases’—‘the People’s William,’ ‘the Grand Old Man,’ ‘the Old Parliamentary Hand,’ now, in the part of ‘the Grand Electioneering Agent,’ he demands a vote of confidence from the constituencies. Confidence in what? In the Liberal party? No! The Liberal party, as we knew it, exists no longer. In his Irish project? No! It is dead; to be resuscitated or not, either wholly or in part, just as may suit the personal convenience of the author. In his Government? No. *They are a mere collection of ‘items,’* whom he does not con-

descend to consult. In himself? Yes! This is the latest and most perilous innovation into our constitutional practices. A pure, unadulterated, personal plébiscite, that is the demand—a political expedient borrowed from the last and worst days of the Second Empire.”

From the foregoing speeches and addresses the respective position taken up by the leading men of the various political groups may be gathered. Their subsequent speeches amplified or repeated the same arguments. Mr. Gladstone's aim was apparently to put before the electors, to the exclusion of every other consideration, the principle of an Irish Assembly dealing with exclusively Irish affairs; Mr. J. Morley was primarily anxious to get rid of the Irish members from Westminster, and Lord Spencer to insure the simultaneous passing of an Irish Land Bill. On the other side, Lord Hartington was chiefly concerned with the maintenance of the supremacy of the British Parliament; whilst Mr. Chamberlain pressed forward the dangers of loyal Ulster, and of the British taxpayer. Mr. Goschen argued that the attempt to distinguish between Irish, Scotch, and English affairs, however easy in theory, was impossible in practice. The Conservatives were able to show a more united front, basing, however, their opposition to both bills rather on their distrust in Mr. Gladstone and his Irish allies than upon any line of argument which distinguished them fundamentally from the Liberal Unionists. It was against these, moreover, that the anger and efforts of the Ministerialists were most concentrated, and every seat outside Birmingham occupied by members of the group was bitterly contested. Lord Hartington, Mr. Goschen, Mr. George Trevelyan, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Rylands, and Mr. Caine were amongst those whose rejection by their constituencies was most actively pursued. It was felt, however, by the party managers that Mr. Gladstone's speeches in Midlothian had failed to afford his supporters arguments or convictions sufficient to meet the attacks by which they were assailed, and Mr. Gladstone was consequently induced to appear at Manchester (June 25) on the eve of the dissolution of Parliament to give a clearer clue to the line upon which the campaign was to be fought. His reception in the streets and at the Free Trade Hall was as enthusiastic as ever; whilst his oratory reminded his hearers of the days of his earlier triumphs. Taking the main points of his Irish policy in succession, he touched first upon the retention of the Irish members at Westminster.

“It appears to me to be an act of great self-denial on the part of the Irish members that they should show such a confidence in the working of the British Parliament as to be content to leave the whole of their imperial interests in our hands. But undoubtedly a very strong desire has been shown in England that Ireland should not be severed from the transaction of imperial concerns, and I wish to remind you that we have undertaken two things in



the bill—provided for certain contingencies, and besides that have undertaken that the interests of Ireland should not be affected without giving her members the opportunity of being heard, and we have also undertaken to propose a plan for recognising permanently the concern of Ireland in the transaction imperial as distinct from Irish business.”

Mr. Gladstone then turned to the Land Bill, of which some persons had spoken as if it were some novel expedient. He appeared to forget that there was in Ireland at that moment in operation, at the expense of the British taxpayer, a system of land purchase under which land to the amount of millions might be transferred upon his responsibility, a system which he considered dangerous, and which undoubtedly he never would engage not to make some effort to amend. A gigantic plan had been propounded by a great statistical authority—Mr. Giffen—involving the issue of 160 millions of Consols. By the side of this magnificent scheme the plan of the Government in regard to land purchase dwindled into utter insignificance; and yet it was commonly said that even this magnificent scheme—declared to deserve attention and spoken of in general terms of praise in an article in the *Fortnightly Review*—had the countenance—the author of the article said—of Mr. Chamberlain.

“I am told he owned it at the time; it would be interesting to know whether he owns it now. He has been, of all others, the severest critic of the plans of the Government. Now I tell you what I propose to him on this subject of land purchase. I propose to him that he should produce to the country the plan which he himself prepared in February last, and which he requested me to cause to be printed for the consideration of the Government. I think that is a fair demand to make, and I think I can venture to assure you that if you have the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the plan, which was not a mere suggestion, but a plan formally drawn out, you will think that it stands in a curious contrast with the latest views of Mr. Chamberlain on land purchase in Ireland. Let that matter stand for a moment. I speak now of the Land Purchase Bill. There cannot be a doubt that the Land Purchase Bill has been ill received by the country. That I admit. It has been ill received by those who were supposed to be likely to receive it well—by Lord Hartington, who said it was a bill which nobody seemed to approve, and then by Mr. Goschen. Mr. Goschen finding that, I imagine, he is totally out of sympathy with the country upon every possible point of politics, lays hands on the Land Purchase Bill, and tears it in pieces in order to find one point of contact at least with the feelings of the country. However, I admit the fact, and I remind you of what I assume to be the position of the Land Purchase Bill. The Land Purchase Bill ought to be considered as if it were so many clauses of the Irish Government Bill. It is not the end of the scheme; it is part of the machinery of the scheme. I stated in introducing it that

would introduce it as part of the Government of Ireland Bill had it not been for the vastness of the volume of the entire bill. Of course, it is liable in the first place to disapproval by all those friends of Home Rule in Ireland who do not like the clauses of the bill; and, in the second place, to review and even to reconstruction if a better method can be obtained, or, if it can be shown that there is no case of honour or duty or policy for persevering with such a plan, it is open to review, reconstruction, or even rejection by the people. It will be our duty to reconsider it upon the principles that we have already laid down."

Passing next to the position occupied by the dissentient Whigs, Mr. Gladstone said: "Lord Hartington has published in his election address the conditions which he thinks necessary to be observed for Ireland in legislating for Ireland. The first is that the Irish representatives shall remain in Parliament, just as it now is. Now I will not be a party to giving to Ireland a legislative body to manage Irish concerns, and at the same time have Irish members in London acting and voting on English and Scotch concerns. The second of Lord Hartington's conditions is that the powers shall be delegated and not surrendered. With that I have no quarrel. It is the exact thing that we are doing. We are constituting certain powers by Act of Parliament, and all the powers so constituted are powers delegated and not surrendered. Thirdly, Lord Hartington says you ought to give them power over certain Irish affairs. Again I am obliged to part company with Lord Hartington. We have never introduced that degrading distinction in delegating with the smallest of our colonies, so far as I am aware—we certainly have not introduced it in the case of Canada; and I will not put upon Ireland a disability which I thought would be dishonouring to the colonial subjects of the Queen. Lastly, the fourth of Lord Hartington's conditions—that we must retain in our own hands the administration of justice—is that which excites the sorest memories in the minds and hearts of the Irish people, and, I am sorry to say, with too much reason. As to the judges, perhaps you know that we have surrounded all the existing judges in Ireland with every security that the wit of man could devise, and I will tell you that it will be a long time before they get rid of these existing judges. These judges will give perfect satisfaction to the Irish people, and long before they become too few for their work you will know by practical experience whether this scheme of local self-government in Ireland is working well or ill. Now, gentlemen, I cannot accept the four conditions of Lord Hartington. We want to meet the wants of Ireland as a matter of business. We want also to give reasonable satisfaction to her national aspirations. And why? Because experience has shown—we wanted the lesson—that nationality is one of the most powerful and one of the most useful factors in human affairs; that you may enlist it in the service of law and order with infi-

nite advantage, whereas if it is not your friend it will be your enemy, and will teach you by sorrowful and painful lessons that it cannot be denied with impunity."

Mr. Morley, at Newcastle (June 26), asserted in even stronger terms his objection to the grant of municipal liberties in Ireland. He said the rates were increasing in Ireland everywhere, and not, as Mr. Goschen had said, only in districts where the National League was strong. "The evil is enormous," and the landlords bleeding to death; and of course, "if you increase the power and the number and the functions of local bodies, you are increasing their power of oppressing the landlords and bleeding them to death." Mr. Morley repeated that he would be no party to any scheme which left the Land Question in Ireland upon the shoulders of an Irish Government.

At Liverpool Mr. Gladstone spoke once more (June 28) before an enthusiastic audience, when he warmly repudiated the statement that the Government wished to deny to Ulster the privileges they desired to give to the other parts of Ireland. He denied that the Land Purchase Bill involved the expenditure of millions of the money of the British taxpayers, because investing in Consols was not expenditure; if it had involved the expenditure of any money at all, he would have been the first to throw the bill behind the fire. If, however, the Liberal Government returned to power, the whole question would have to be considered afresh. Mr. Gladstone then enumerated the subjects which had constituted the political life of the previous sixty years, and on every one of them he submitted that the masses had been right and the classes wrong. He likened the Parliament of England to Sindbad the Sailor, and Ireland to the Old Man of the Sea, "whom, by our foolish initiative, we have almost compelled to place herself on our back; and she rides you, and will ride you, until, listening to her reasonable demands, you shall consent to some arrangement that justice and policy alike say are right." The Act of Union he characterised as an artificial combination of fraud and force, applied in the basest manner to attain an end which all Ireland detested. He continued, "How have we atoned since the Union for what we did to bring about the Union? The Union was followed by these six consequences: first, broken promises; secondly, the passing of bad laws; thirdly, the putting down of liberty; fourthly, the withholding from Ireland benefits that we took to ourselves; fifthly, the giving to force, and to force only, what we ought to have given to honour and justice; and sixthly, the removal and postponement of relief to the most crying grievances." In conclusion, he expressed himself conscious of the great controversy which had been raised between the two nations, and added, "I wish we could expand our minds and raise our views to a point necessary to understand what these controversies really are, how deep their roots go down, what enormous results they produce, and

through what enormous periods of time upon the peace and happiness of mankind they extend. Many of you will recollect, in that spirited old ballad of 'Chevy Chase'—

The child that is unborn shall rue  
The hunting of that day.

And so, should you fail in your duties on this occasion, should the idle and shallow pretexts that are used against us bewilder the minds of the people of England or of Scotland, or should the power of the purse, of wealth, of title, of station, of rank—should all these powers overbear the national sense, I fear it may again be true that the child that is unborn shall rue the voting of that day. I entreat you—you require it little, but I entreat through you the people of this country to bethink themselves well of the position in which they stand, to look back upon the history of the past and forward in the prospects of the future, to determine that it shall no longer be said throughout the civilised world that Ireland is the Poland of England. Let us determine not to have a Poland any longer. We have had it long enough. Listen to prudence, listen to courage, listen to honour, and speak the words of the poet—

Ring out the old, ring in the new.

Ring out the notes and the memory of discord; ring in the blessed reign and time of peace."

Lord Hartington replied at Sheffield (June 28) to the former of these speeches; but more particularly commented on a letter written by the Prime Minister, in which he denied that for fifteen years previously he had ever expressed his disapproval of Home Rule. Admitting this might be a correct statement, Lord Hartington asked what had been the leader's attitude to his followers or to his Cabinet. Had he ever communicated even to his Irish Secretary the least inclination to accept that system? Had he not appointed to be Irish Secretary Mr. Forster, who had been prominent amongst the opponents of Mr. Butt's Home Rule Bill? If, during those years, Mr. Gladstone was nurturing the belief that Home Rule might, after all, be the true remedy for the difficulties of Irish government, he was guilty, argued Lord Hartington, of great responsibility in acquiescing silently in the avowed convictions of his colleagues who were in favour of resistance to Home Rule.

At Cardiff, two days later (June 30), Lord Hartington replied to Mr. Gladstone's assertion that he had condemned the Parnellites in 1881 because they were wrong, but supported them in 1886 because they were right. He asked when it was that the Parnellite policy underwent a change, and whether it ever changed until Mr. Gladstone brought in his bill conceding the greater part of their demands. Did they ever withdraw the views which in 1881 Mr. Gladstone had described as a "policy of plunder"? Had not those views been virtually reiterated by

Mr. Parnell and his friends again and again? Had they ever condemned the boycotting and tyranny of the National League? Had they not gratefully accepted subscriptions from those American followers who issued the "literature of assassination"? Had they not defended the National League when it had covered with contumely the whole judicial staff of Ireland, from the judges to the process-servers? Was there the slightest evidence that in any one respect the Parnellite party had abjured the policy and doctrines and practices of 1881, until they found that Mr. Gladstone was their devout and convinced proselyte in 1886? In 1881 the resources of civilisation were to be drawn upon without limit to defeat Mr. Parnell. Now, without any change in Mr. Parnell, Mr. Gladstone had declared himself for the very man against whom he was then so anxious to invoke all those inexhaustible resources.

On the day intervening (June 29) between these two speeches of the leader of the Liberal Unionists, Lord Salisbury, at St. James's Hall, had addressed to his Conservative followers a manifesto for their guidance during the elections. He denied most absolutely Mr. Parnell's statements as to the Tory Cabinet having considered Home Rule, declaring that he himself had told Lord Carnarvon before his departure that he would never be a member of a Government which accepted that proposal. Lord Randolph Churchill, also, had been equally strong. He accused Mr. Gladstone of raising questions during the campaign, such as that of "the classes," in order to prevent the people from considering the true issue, and ridiculed the assertion that the settlement would be final. The tribute would be cancelled by a stroke of the pen if the Irish could secure real separation, and for separation, therefore, they would try. Mr. Gladstone said God could not have created such monsters as the Irish were assumed to be; but did he really never meet a man who took advantage, or did he think him uncreated? Over all Europe unification was going on, not disintegration, except only in Turkey, because Turkey was decrepit. For sixty years the Scotch had hated the Union, but they did not hate it now. Mr. Gladstone had ruled in 1745, and had declared that Jacobins must be ruled by love, what would be the position of affairs? Considering the difficulties to be overcome, the religious obstacles to be faced, our own vacillating and changing habits of government, and the wave of superficial philanthropy which even now and then swept over the land, it was far too soon to say that the Union, under which the material condition of Ireland has improved, has failed, or that "the strong, mediating hand" of Britain should be taken away.

Mr. John Bright had no occasion to address his electors until he came to thank them for returning him unopposed. On that occasion (July 1) he reviewed in homely language the political situation, and his own action on the Irish question. He pointed



out that for three-and-twenty years before Mr. Gladstone took up the Irish question he had been urging attention to matters connected with it, and had seen some of his reforms tardily carried out. Looking back, however, on the history of the previous seventeen years, he asked whether any parliament in the world could have done more for the country it represented than the Parliament of Westminster had done for Ireland. The result of all his study of the Irish question—a study conducted on the spot, in two long visits, as well as by careful reading—was “that with all my sympathy with Ireland, I am entirely against anything in any shape which shall be called a parliament in Dublin.” As for Mr. Gladstone’s statutory Legislature, he described it as “a vestry which will be incessantly beating against the bars of its cage, striving to become a parliament.” Concerning the proposed arrangement for bringing back Irish members to Westminster to discuss imperial questions, he asked, “What would be the result of having an intermittent Irish fever in the House of Commons?” He protested against “thrusting out from the shelter and the justice of the United Parliament” the 2,000,000 out of 5,000,000 “who remain with us, who cling to us, who passionately resent the attempt to drive them from the protection of the Parliament of their ancestors.” He utterly declined to surrender the field to a parliamentary party from Ireland, “one-half of whom have dollars in their pockets subscribed by the enemies of England in the United States.” “There may be men,” he said, “who have read more history than I have, and who remember better what they have read; but I believe that history has no example of a monarchy or a republic submitting to a capitulation at once so unnecessary and so humiliating.” Mr. Bright was utterly opposed to the land scheme of the Government, which he described as one for making the English Chancellor of the Exchequer “the universal absentee landlord” over the whole of Ireland. The Irish patriot under the new system would be sure to say, “You have got free from the burden of the local proprietors of the soil: will you pay rents to a foreign Government, sending a collector in a foreign garb?” And as for the security promised by the Prime Minister, “Go,” said Mr. Bright, “to the great house of Rothschild and Co., who can deal in untold millions, and ask them on what terms they will hold you safe for this monstrous speculation on which you are invited to enter by the Prime Minister.”

This speech led to the following correspondence between the two statesmen who had once been colleagues:—

“Hawarden, July 2, 1886.

“MY DEAR BRIGHT,—I am sorry to be compelled again to address you. In your speech you charge me with having successfully concealed my thoughts last November. You ought to have known that this was not the fact, for, in reply to others,

from whom this gross charge was more to be expected than from you, I pointed out last week that on November 9, in Edinburgh I told my constituents that if the Irish elections went as we expected, the magnitude of the subject they would bring forward would throw all others into the shade, and that it 'went down to the very roots and foundations of our whole civil and political constitution.' (Midlothian Speeches, 1885, p. 44.)

" 2. You say I have described a conspiracy now existing in Ireland as marching through rapine to the break-up of the United Kingdom. This also is contrary to the fact. In 1880 there was, in my opinion, such a conspiracy against the payment of rent and the union of the countries, and I so described it. In my opinion there is no such conspiracy now, nor anything in the least degree resembling it. You put into my mouth words which coming from me, would be absolute falsehood.

" 3. You charge me with a want of frankness because I have not pledged the Government to some defined line of action with regard to the Land Purchase Bill. A charge of this kind is unwarranted between old colleagues and old friends, to say the least unusual. Evidently you have not read the bill or my speech on its introduction, and you have never been concerned in the practical work of legislation on difficult and complicated subjects. The foundation of your charge is that, on one of the most difficult and most complicated of all subjects, I do not, in the midst of an overwhelming work, formulate at once a new course or method of action without consulting the colleagues to whom I am so much bound, and from whom I receive invaluable aid. It might, I think, have occurred to you, as you have been in the Cabinet, that such a course on my part would have been indecent and disloyal, and that I should greatly prefer to bear all the charges and suspicions which you are now unexpectedly the man to fasten upon me.

" 4. You state you are convinced it is my intention to thrust the Land Purchase Bill upon the House of Commons. If I am a man capable of such an intention, I wonder you ever took office with one so ignorant of the spirit of the constitution, and so arbitrary in his character.

" Though this appears to be your opinion of me, I do not think it is the opinion held by my countrymen in general. You quote not a word in support of your charge. It is absolutely untrue. Every candidate, friendly or unfriendly, will form his own view and take his course on the subject. We must consider, to the best of our power, all the facts before us; but I certainly will not forego my right to make some effort to amend the dangerous and mischievous land purchase law passed last year for Ireland, if such effort should promise to meet approval. I have done what I could to keep out of controversy with you, and, while driven to remonstrate against your charges, I advisedly abstain from notice of your statements, criticisms, and arguments.—Always  
*yours sincerely,* "W. E. GLADSTONE."

" Bath, July 4.

"MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—I am sorry my speech has so greatly irritated you. It has been as great a grief to me to speak as I have spoken as it can have been to you to listen or to read.

"You say it is a gross charge to say that you concealed your thoughts last November. Surely when you urged the constituencies to send you a Liberal majority large enough to make you independent of Mr. Parnell and his party, the Liberal party and the country understood you to ask for a majority to enable you to resist Mr. Parnell, not to make a complete surrender to him. You object to my quotations about a conspiracy 'marching through rapine to the break-up of the United Kingdom,' and you say there is now no such conspiracy against the payment of rent and the union of the countries. I believe there is now such a conspiracy, and that it is expecting and seeking its further success through your measures.

"You complain that I charge you with a want of frankness in regard to the Land Purchase Bill. You must know that a large number of your supporters are utterly opposed to that bill; if you tie the two bills together, their difficulty in dealing with them will be much increased, and their liberty greatly fettered. I think your friends and your opponents and the country have a right to know your intentions on so great a matter when you are asking them to elect a parliament in your favour. Your language seems to me rather a puzzle than an explanation, and that of your colleagues, though contradictory, is not much clearer.

"I have done what I could to keep out of controversy with you. I have not urged any man in Parliament, or out of it, to vote against you. I have abstained from speaking in public until I was in the face of my constituents, who have returned me unopposed to the new Parliament, and to them I was bound to explain my opinion of and my judgment on your Irish bills. I stand by what I have said, and shall be surprised if the new Parliament be more favourable to your Irish measures than the one you have thought it necessary to dissolve.

"Though I thus differ from you at this time and on this question, do not imagine that I can ever cease to admire your great qualities, or to value the great services you have rendered to your country.—Yours sincerely,

" JOHN BRIGHT."

Another question which excited much discussion and mutual recrimination was the part alleged to have been played by Mr. Gladstone in the previous December, relative to an offer from him to support Lord Salisbury in a measure which would lead to the pacification of Ireland. Mr. A. J. Balfour was at length invited by Mr. Gladstone to give his version of the conversation at Eaton Hall, out of which the subsequent negotiations arose. Mr. Balfour then wrote as follows: "The conversation, *entirely informal, and so to speak accidental*, which took place

Eaton, and which was the immediate occasion of Mr. Gladstone's first letter to me, herewith printed, consisted chiefly, if my memory does not deceive me, of statements made by Mr. Gladstone to me respecting the serious condition of Ireland, and the urgency of the problem which it presented to the Government. He told me that he had information of an authentic kind, but not from Mr. Parnell, which caused him to believe that there was a power behind Mr. Parnell which, if not shortly satisfied by some substantial concession to the demands of the Irish Parliamentary party, would take the matter into its own hands and resort to violence and outrage in England for the purpose of enforcing its demands. 'In other words,' I said to Mr. Gladstone, 'we are to be blown up and stabbed if we do not grant Home Rule by the end of next session.' 'I understand,' answered Mr. Gladstone, 'that the time is shorter than that.' This is the portion of our brief conversation which has impressed itself most deeply upon my mind, and of which I gave an account to more than one person at the time. It is, so far as I recollect (though in this I may be mistaken), the only portion relevant to the correspondence which followed, and of which I enclose a copy."

Of this correspondence the first letter was one from Mr. Gladstone, dated Dec. 20. It was as follows: "On reflection I think that what I said to you in our conversation at Eaton may have amounted to the conveyance of a hope that the Government would take a strong and early decision on the Irish question. For I spoke of the stir in men's minds, and of the urgency of this matter, to both of which every day's post brings me new testimony. This being so, I wish, under the very peculiar circumstances of the case, to go a step further, and say that I think it will be a public calamity if this great subject should fall into the lines of party conflict. I feel sure the question can only be dealt with by a Government, and I desire, specially on ground of public policy, that it should be dealt with by the *present* Government. If, therefore, they bring in a proposal for settling the whole question of the future government of Ireland, my desire will be, reserving, of course, necessary freedom, to treat it in the same spirit in which I have endeavoured to proceed in respect to Afghanistan and with respect to the Balkan peninsula. You are at liberty, if you think it desirable, to mention this to Lord Salisbury. But for a great pressure on me I should have sent this letter sooner. I am writing, however, for myself, and without consultation."

On Dec. 22, the day on which the letter was received Mr. Balfour replied: "I have as yet had no opportunity of showing it to Lord Salisbury or of consulting him as to its contents, but I am sure he will receive without any surprise the statement of your earnest hope that the Irish question should *not fall into the lines of party conflict*. If the ingenuity of any

Ministry is sufficient to devise some adequate and lasting remedy for the chronic ills of Ireland, I am certain it will be the wish of the leaders of the Opposition, to whichever side they may belong, to treat the question as a national and not as a party one, though I fear that under our existing parliamentary system this will not prove so easy when we are dealing with an integral portion of the United Kingdom as it proved when we were concerned with the remote regions of Roumelia and Afghanistan. If anything arises out of your letter which I think ought to be communicated to you, I hope you will allow me to write to you again."

On the 23rd Mr. Gladstone wrote: "I thank you for your note, and, taking its spirit into view, I think I ought to complete my former communication by assuring you that, while expressing a desire that the Government should act, I am not myself acting. Time is precious, and is of the essence of the case. But wishing them to have a fair opportunity of taking their decision, I have felt that so long as I entertained the hope connected with that wish (and how long that will be of course I cannot say), I should decline all communication of my own views beyond the circle of private confidence, and only allow to be fully known my great anxiety that the Government should decide and act in this great matter."

To this Mr. Balfour's reply was: "I have shown your last letter to Lord Salisbury. He desires me to express his great sense of the courteous and conciliatory spirit in which it is written. It suggests, however, a communication of the views of the Government which at this stage would be at variance with usage. As Parliament will meet for business before the usual time he thinks it better to avoid a departure from the ordinary practice, which might be misunderstood."

The last letter, which was from Mr. Gladstone, is dated Jan. 5, and is marked "most private": "I entirely agree with you and with Lord Salisbury on the subject of my communication of the intention of Ministers respecting Ireland to me. If my note appeared to convey any suggestion to that effect, it was quite opposed to my intention."

Mr. Balfour, in publishing an account of the interview, explained to Mr. Gladstone that the observations of Lord Randolph Churchill, to which the Premier had recently taken exception, seemed to convey—"There was nothing in that letter (meaning your first letter to me) to indicate what scheme Mr. Gladstone was prepared to support, and the words used taken by themselves, and without the commentary supplied by Mr. Herbert Gladstone's indiscretions, would have covered a policy of coercion as well as a policy of Home Rule."

This correspondence, Mr. Balfour held, could bear but one interpretation. "If I assumed without hesitation that your expression, 'settlement of the whole question of the future



government of Ireland,' referred to a policy of Home Rule, it was not so much on account of its less ambiguous character as in consequence of the elucidations furnished by the unauthorised rumour which appeared in the *Leeds Mercury*."

The elections opened (July 1) with the solitary contest at Colchester, and were allowed under the antiquated system, perversely maintained apparently in the interests of election agents alone, to continue for nearly the whole month. The Ministerialists founded their hopes upon the displacement of the Irish vote in the United Kingdom, and upon the activity and power of the local caucuses, which now took their cue from Leeds and London rather than from Birmingham. With regard to the value of the first-named influence there seems to have existed some very strange misconceptions. It was asserted by the Parnellites and their friends that the Irish vote had been a determining factor in forty constituencies, and that its transfer from the Conservatives to whom it had, as was affirmed, been given, would more than outweigh the defections caused by the Unionists. A closer investigation, however, showed that the entire Irish vote in the United Kingdom could scarcely exceed 40,000 persons, of whom three-fourths were resident in London, Liverpool, and Glasgow. The remainder were scattered in such small numbers throughout the country that a very slight analysis of the voting returns showed their influence to be comparatively insignificant. The chief hopes of the Ministerialists lay in the boroughs, where in the preceding autumn they had experienced so many unexpected defeats. On the first day the return of so large a preponderance of unopposed Conservatives (50) and Unionists (10), against the Gladstonians (16) and Parnellites (9), naturally encouraged the former, although it had little real significance, for on the first batch of contested elections the gains and losses of each party were equal; but it was noticeable that whilst the Gladstonians were returned in all cases by diminished majorities, the Conservatives and Unionists secured their seats by heavier votes than in the previous autumn. On the following day (July 3) the fortunes of the Government began to wane, Birmingham returning a solid body of Unionists; although at Liverpool, Manchester and Leeds the Ministerialists showed in greater strength. The greatest successes were, however, in East Edinburgh, where Mr. Goschen, who had been returned in November by a majority of 2,408, was now defeated by a majority of 1,440; and in the Boroughs, where Sir George Trevelyan had held a safe seat for more than a dozen years. On the other hand, the Ministerialists in vain attempted to displace Lord Hartington in North-east Lancashire, Mr. Courtney in South-east Cornwall, and Mr. Caird at Barrow. The borough elections, however, in which they suffered most disastrously were those for metropolitan districts. At the previous elections 25 Liberals had been returned against 37 Conservatives. At the elections of 1886 the former only secured

11 seats, whilst 48 fell to the Conservatives and 3 to the Unionists. The whole of the English boroughs south of the Thames and the Severn (with the exception of Gloucester and Bristol, a seat each, Battersea and Southwark, two divisions, and North Camberwell) returned either Conservatives or Unionists; and their successes extended through the midland counties, especially along the Welsh border, and up the eastern coast as far as the Humber. Cheshire, Lancashire, and even North Wales testified, though in a more modified form, their dissent from Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule policy. To sum up, the English and Welsh boroughs, which in the previous autumn had returned 122 Conservatives and 120 Liberals, were now represented by 153 Conservatives, 20 Unionists, and only 69 Liberals.

But if the results of the borough elections were dispiriting to the Ministerialists, in the counties the case was still worse. In East Anglia, the Midlands, Yorkshire, Lancashire, and even in "gallant little Wales," the Conservatives and the Unionists carried seat after seat which had hitherto been represented by the adherents of Mr. Gladstone. In the previous autumn the English and Welsh counties had returned 152 Liberals and 101 Conservatives; six months later only, the results showed 83 Liberals, 136 Conservatives, and 34 Unionists. Lord Hartington's triumphant return for the Rossendale Division of Lancashire by a majority of 1,450 over the Gladstonian candidate, Mr. Newbigging, was perhaps the most important contest in the counties; for he found arrayed against him a large number of his own most prominent supporters, as well as a considerable Irish vote. A few months previously he had defeated Mr. Ecroyd, the champion of fair trade and a Conservative, by a still larger majority; but the contest had not been nearly so keen as on the present occasion. In Lancashire alone the Unionists won four divisions from the Ministerialists, while the Ministerialists were only successful in one against the Unionists. In nearly every case, too, of a contest, not only in Lancashire, the Ministerialists held their own by greatly reduced majorities, whilst the Unionists and Conservatives, even when defeated, could point to largely increased votes. In some instances members whose names had been for years, or even generations, associated with the districts they represented were hopelessly defeated by candidates whose claim to confidence was their determination to maintain the United Kingdom intact. Sir Thomas Acland was beaten in his own county (West Somerset) by Mr. Charles Elton, Q.C., by nearly a thousand votes, although in the autumn he had won the seat against the same antagonist by more than five hundred. Lord William Compton suffered a like defeat in South-west Warwickshire; whilst in Staffordshire (North-west), Captain Edward Heathcote replaced Mr. Leveson-Gower, and similar revolutions of public opinion were found all over the country. Northumberland was almost the only English county where the

phalanx of Liberal members was in vain assailed. In Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, and Yorkshire the alliance of the Conservatives and Unionist Liberals also proved of little avail. As a rule the compact between the leaders of these two parties had been honourably observed by the electors; and although in many, if not most, instances far fewer votes were polled in the present elections than in the previous year, the abstentions were not more marked on the Conservative than on the Liberal side. In East Hampshire an attempt to replace Viscount Wolmer (Unionist) by a Conservative failed; but in East Essex Mr. Kitching, and in South Essex Mr. J. Westlake, Q.C., were rejected, although the latter had not only exposed in a masterly speech the fallacies of Mr. Gladstone's Irish land policy, but on the critical division which had upset the Conservative Government had been amongst the few Liberals who had refused to vote in favour of an abstract resolution. At Stroud, Mr. Brand, who had been amongst the most active organisers of the Unionist party, was forced to stand aside in favour of Mr. Holloway, a local Conservative; and Mr. Bickersteth was compelled to a like course in North Shropshire. In all these cases the action of the Conservatives, though not always successful, was severely reprobated. The pledge given by their leaders had been precise and formal; and their attempt to explain away its application in particular instances was regarded as a readiness to place party considerations before public interests.

Scotland, although in the main faithful to Mr. Gladstone, showed that the bait of Home Rule had but little allurements for a people which, after nearly two centuries, had found the imperial system suited to their requirements. In 1885 the Scotch boroughs and universities had been represented by thirty Liberals and two Conservatives, and the Scotch county constituencies by thirty-one Liberals and seven Conservatives. The appeal of the present year resulted in the return of twenty-two Ministerialists, three Conservatives, and eight Unionists for the borough seats, and twenty Ministerialists, nine Conservatives, and nine Unionists for the counties. In other words, Mr. Gladstone's immediate followers had fallen from sixty-one to forty-two. In Ireland there had been a loss of one Conservative seat in Belfast, which was balanced by the rescue of a seat in Tyrone from the Parnellites, where Mr. W. O'Brien, the editor of *United Ireland*, was defeated by the Unionist candidate, Mr. W. L. Russell; and in South Londonderry Mr. T. Healy, another leading Home Ruler, was defeated by Mr. T. Lea, an English Conservative. The actual number of Mr. Parnell's followers was thus reduced by one to a total of eighty-four, but the result of a subsequent election restored them to their original number, by electing Mr. J. M. McCarthy in the place of Mr. C. E. Lewis. The final result of the election showed that the new House of Commons would consist of 316 Conservatives, 78

beral Unionists, 191 Gladstonians, and 85 Parnellites, Mr. P. O'Connor having retained his seat for a division of Liverpool. The net result, therefore, of the appeal to the constituents was to convert the majority of thirty who had voted against Gladstone's Bill into one of 113. On that occasion ninety-three Unionist Liberals had gone into the lobby with the Conservatives, and eight others had absented themselves. Of these, were again returned by their electors, whilst of the 231 Gladstonians who voted for the bill, only 193 were re-elected. The result was a net gain to the Conservatives of 67, of whom were gained from the Liberals, 28 from the Unionists, and from the Parnellites. Of the Unionists returned, it was intimated that not more than twelve were adherents of Mr. Chamberlain; and that, although agreed on the fundamental question of refusing legislative independence to Ireland, they were upon other questions still in sympathy rather with the supporters of Mr. Gladstone than with the followers of Lord Hartington. The following table shows the relation of the members to the electorate, but allowance must be made for unopposed returns. In the elections of 1885 the number of Liberals returned without contest was 13, Conservatives 10, and Parnellites 17. In the elections of the present year, however, 42 Liberals, 1 Unionist, 86 Conservatives, and 66 Parnellites were returned unopposed. The actual votes polled were—

	Aggregate Liberal Vote.		Aggregate Parnellite Vote.		Aggregate Conservative Vote.		
	1885.	1886.	1885.	1886.	1885.	1886.	
						Con.	Un.
London . . . . .	172,384	118,901	—	—	193,186	154,136	7,945
English Boroughs . . . . .	556,962	410,110	2,824	2,911	519,004	348,925	72,698
Welsh Boroughs . . . . .	126,959	81,575	—	—	61,207	14,433	55,047
English Counties . . . . .	1,113,693	524,508	—	—	954,055	399,297	174,320
Welsh Counties . . . . .	156,920	101,647	—	—	95,382	38,762	51,335
Ireland . . . . .	30,694	—	296,960	96,713	111,616	81,096	18,483
<b>Totals . . . . .</b>	<b>2,157,612</b>	<b>1,236,741</b>	<b>299,784</b>	<b>99,624</b>	<b>1,934,450</b>	<b>1,036,649</b>	<b>379,823</b>

In the presence of such a result, although no single party could claim an absolute majority of the House, Mr. Gladstone's course, indicated by himself, was clear. Consequently, before the actual returns had been received from some distant constituencies, Cabinet Council assembled (July 20) and formally decided upon resignation, which was notified to her Majesty on the following day, and duly accepted. By the advice of Mr. Gladstone the Queen at once sent for Lord Salisbury, and, in the interval which elapsed before his return from Royat, speculation was

phalanx of Liberal members was in vain assailed. In Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, and Yorkshire the alliance of the Conservatives and Unionist Liberals also proved of little avail. As a rule the compact between the leaders of these two parties had been honourably observed by the electors; and although in many, if not most, instances far fewer votes were polled in the present elections than in the previous year, the abstentions were not more marked on the Conservative than on the Liberal side. In East Hampshire an attempt to replace Viscount Wolme (Unionist) by a Conservative failed; but in East Essex Mr. Kitching, and in South Essex Mr. J. Westlake, Q.C., were rejected, although the latter had not only exposed in a masterly speech the fallacies of Mr. Gladstone's Irish land policy, but on the critical division which had upset the Conservative Government had been amongst the few Liberals who had refused to vote in favour of an abstract resolution. At Stroud, Mr. Brand who had been amongst the most active organisers of the Unionist party, was forced to stand aside in favour of Mr. Holloway, local Conservative; and Mr. Bickersteth was compelled to take like course in North Shropshire. In all these cases the action of the Conservatives, though not always successful, was severely reprobated. The pledge given by their leaders had been precise and formal; and their attempt to explain away its application in particular instances was regarded as a readiness to place party considerations before public interests.

Scotland, although in the main faithful to Mr. Gladstone, showed that the bait of Home Rule had but little allurements for a people which, after nearly two centuries, had found the imperial system suited to their requirements. In 1885 the Scotch boroughs and universities had been represented by thirty Liberals and two Conservatives, and the Scotch county constituencies by thirty-one Liberals and seven Conservatives. The appeal of the present year resulted in the return of twenty-two Ministerialists, three Conservatives, and eight Unionists for the borough seats, and twenty Ministerialists, nine Conservatives and nine Unionists for the counties. In other words, Mr. Gladstone's immediate followers had fallen from sixty-one to forty-two. In Ireland there had been a loss of one Conservative seat in Belfast, which was balanced by the rescue of a seat in Tyrone from the Parnellites, where Mr. W. O'Brien, the editor of *United Ireland*, was defeated by the Unionist candidate, Mr. W. L. Russell; and in South Londonderry Mr. T. Healy, another leading Home Ruler, was defeated by Mr. T. Lea, an English Unionist. The actual number of Mr. Parnell's followers was thus reduced by one to a total of eighty-four, but the result of a subsequent counting restored them to their original number, by seating at Derry Mr. J. McCarthy in the place of Mr. C. E. Lewis. The final result of the election showed that the new House of Commons on its assembling would consist of 316 Conservatives, 78



Liberal Unionists, 191 Gladstonians, and 85 Parnellites, Mr. T. P. O'Connor having retained his seat for a division of Liverpool. The net result, therefore, of the appeal to the constituencies was to convert the majority of thirty who had voted against Mr. Gladstone's Bill into one of 113. On that occasion ninety-three Unionist Liberals had gone into the lobby with the Conservatives, and eight others had absented themselves. Of these, 73 were again returned by their electors, whilst of the 231 Gladstonians who voted for the bill, only 193 were re-elected. The result was a net gain to the Conservatives of 67, of whom 38 were gained from the Liberals, 28 from the Unionists, and 1 from the Parnellites. Of the Unionists returned, it was intimated that not more than twelve were adherents of Mr. Chamberlain; and that, although agreed on the fundamental question of refusing legislative independence to Ireland, they were upon other questions still in sympathy rather with the supporters of Mr. Gladstone than with the followers of Lord Hartington. The following table shows the relation of the members to the electorate, but allowance must be made for unopposed returns. In the elections of 1885 the number of Liberals returned without contest was 13, Conservatives 10, and Parnellites 17. In the elections of the present year, however, 42 Liberals, 24 Unionists, 86 Conservatives, and 66 Parnellites were returned unopposed. The actual votes polled were—

	Aggregate Liberal Vote.		Aggregate Parnellite Vote.		Aggregate Conservative Vote.		
	1885.	1886.	1885.	1886.	1885.	1886.	
						Con.	Un.
London . . . . .	172,384	118,901	—	—	193,186	154,136	7,945
English Boroughs . . . . .	556,962	410,110	2,824	2,911	519,004	348,925	72,698
Scotch Boroughs . . . . .	126,959	81,575	—	—	61,207	14,433	55,047
English Counties . . . . .	1,113,693	524,508	—	—	954,055	399,297	174,320
Scotch Counties . . . . .	156,920	101,647	—	—	95,382	38,762	51,335
Ireland . . . . .	30,694	—	296,960	96,713	111,616	81,096	18,483
<b>Totals . . . . .</b>	<b>2,157,612</b>	<b>1,236,741</b>	<b>299,784</b>	<b>99,624</b>	<b>1,934,450</b>	<b>1,036,649</b>	<b>379,823</b>

In the presence of such a result, although no single party could claim an absolute majority of the House, Mr. Gladstone's course, as indicated by himself, was clear. Consequently, before the final returns had been received from some distant constituencies, a Cabinet Council assembled (July 20) and formally decided upon resignation, which was notified to her Majesty on the following day, and duly accepted. By the advice of Mr. Gladstone the Queen at once sent for Lord Salisbury, and, in the interval which elapsed before his return from Royat, speculation was

busy as to the course he would take. In the new Parliament it was no longer the Parnellites who held the balance between the two great political parties. Even when united with the Gladstonians they would be able to muster only 276 against 316 Conservatives; but in the event of a reunion of the Liberal party that body would outnumber the Conservatives by 28 votes. The Unionists were therefore masters of the situation, and it was thought that either a Coalition Government might be formed, or that even Lord Hartington might be induced to form a Liberal Government, relying upon the Conservatives for support. Lord Hartington, however, as it appeared, had no intention of forsaking the Liberal party, or of facing the electors as the supporter of a Conservative Cabinet; and although Lord Salisbury on his return offered to stand aside, or, if necessary, to take office under Lord Hartington, the latter finally declined, and the Conservative leader, assured of the benevolent support of the Unionists, was left free to select an administration from amongst his own followers. The most important and most surprising selection was that of Lord Randolph Churchill to be Chancellor of the Exchequer and leader of the House of Commons; and scarcely less unexpected was that of Mr. Henry Matthews, Q.C., an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, who had once been a supporter of Mr. Isaac Butt when he had represented Dungarvan, but who had defeated Alderman Cook in East Birmingham in the previous autumn. Lord Iddesleigh became Foreign Secretary, Mr. W. H. Smith Secretary for War, Lord George Hamilton First Lord of the Admiralty, and Sir M. Hicks-Beach Secretary for Ireland. The new Viceroy, the Marquess of Londonderry, had no seat in the Cabinet, but a place in it was given to Lord Ashbourne, the Lord Chancellor for Ireland. The remainder of the offices were distributed, for the most part, amongst the members of the previous Conservative administration, but Mr. H. Chaplin declined the Presidency of the Board of Trade because the offer was unaccompanied by a seat in the Cabinet. Before his final arrangements were made, Lord Salisbury called together at the Carlton Club (July 27) the whole of the Conservative members, and explained to them the course he had taken. He had, with the Queen's permission, urged Lord Hartington to form a Ministry for himself, and had promised to give him the support of the Conservative party if he preferred to form a Government consisting solely of Unionist Liberals. These offers Lord Hartington had declined, declaring that his true part was to stand altogether aloof from party combinations and coalitions, and to support the Conservative Government so long as it adhered to the policy on which the two parties were agreed. Lord Salisbury also referred to the two suggestions that had been put forward for completing the routine business and voting the supplies of the year, interrupted by the dissolution. One proposal was to adjourn as soon as the new writs had been issued, and

reassemble in October for an autumn session, with an adjournment over Christmas; the other was to sit through August, proceeding at once with the estimates, voting the necessary supplies, and to close a short session, complete in itself, in the ordinary way. By this means an autumn sitting might be avoided, and Parliament would reassemble in ordinary course early in the following year, when the Government would be prepared to state its Irish policy. The latter suggestion, which was ultimately acted upon, was declared by the Liberals to be tantamount to a confession that the Conservatives had no Irish policy at all, and a threat was held out that until the policy of the new advisers of the Crown was made known the Commons were justified in withholding supply.

When Parliament met (Aug. 5) its first business was to choose a Speaker, and Sir E. Birkbeck moved and Mr. Gladstone seconded the election of Mr. Peel, which was agreed to without even the formal protest of the Parnellite party. The new writs were then moved for, and the formal meeting of the House adjourned for a fortnight. On the same day Lord Hartington invited the Liberal Unionist members of both Houses to a meeting at Devonshire House, and in the course of a long speech explained the reasons which had weighed with him for not taking office in the new Administration. In such an arrangement, he said, he would have been nothing more than a Liberal leader leading a Conservative Government. The Unionists were Liberal still, and could not enter into such an arrangement. His lordship pointed out that the country had at the elections completely shown its satisfaction at the Unionist policy; and, such being the case, he could not see how it was possible that any member of the Unionist party should oppose the new Government in connection with those questions upon Irish affairs which had been placed before the constituencies. Lord Hartington, however, expressed the hope that within a measurable period the Liberal party would be again united, but that could only be done by the whole party being Unionists. As for the future in Parliament, he promised every facility would be given to Lord Salisbury's Government to carry on business in the present state of affairs; for by opposing the Conservatives the members of the Liberal Unionist party would be aiding in the defeat of the very matter they fought upon at the general election. This was to be prevented at all costs; but he looked forward to a time when Liberals generally would reunite. Mr. Chamberlain followed, speaking in the name of the Radical Unionists, and expressed his complete concurrence with the policy announced by Lord Hartington, and said that from henceforth he would recognise him as his leader. He congratulated those present on the success which had attended the recent election. The meeting, he said, was convened not so much for the purpose of arriving at a definite decision as to their future attitude as to have some conversation in regard to their position.

The country at large having signified its approval of the course they had felt bound to adopt, he had no doubt that the bulk of the Liberal members would ere long be able to find a basis of agreement on which to deal with the Irish question; and he looked forward to their reunion with feelings of unmixed pleasure. He explained that it was the intention of himself and the other Unionist ex-Ministers to take their places on the front Opposition bench, to which they were entitled, thus showing they had in no way separated themselves from the Liberal party. He hoped, in conclusion, that the Liberal Unionist Association and the Birmingham Radical Association, which he had inaugurated, would now amalgamate for a common end. In the discussion which followed, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir Julian Goldsmid, Lord Wolmer, Mr. Rylands, and Mr. Caine took part. The question as to the support which should be given to the Conservative Government was not discussed, as there was a sort of general understanding that no business of importance from a party point of view would be brought forward during the short session which with the concurrence of the Unionists was to be held. The only feature of interest connected with the re-elections was the contest threatened in East Birmingham on the return of the Home Secretary (Mr. H. Matthews). Mr. Alderman Cook, the defeated Glastonbury Liberal at the general election, came forward with the promise to oppose anything like the Land Bill of the late Government, to insist upon the retention of the Irish members at Westminster, and to grant to Ireland only a Parliament subordinate to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. It was hoped that with such a programme the Liberal party might be once more brought into union. But although this interpretation of Alderman Cook's views, as expressed in a letter to Mr. Richard Chamberlain, were so far satisfactory to the Unionists, it was elicited by another correspondent that he had not changed his views since the late election, when he had dissociated himself altogether from the Unionists. In the face of this apparent contradiction, which the candidate failed to explain away, the Radical Unionists refused support Mr. Alderman Cook, and the Home Secretary was ultimately returned unopposed. In one of the speeches which Mr. Matthews addressed to his constituents he took occasion to allude to a remark made by Mr. Gladstone in a letter to one of his numerous correspondents: "It is an open question whether if this folly lasts, the thing may not in the end contribute to the repeal, which I shall greatly regret." And he argued with some effect that it was by accustoming the public ear to suggestions of this sort that the public conscience was lulled into false security, and that at any moment a policy suddenly adopted by a statesman was asserted to have been before his mind for a length of time. The most important sequel, however, to the general election was the publication (Aug. 17) of a manifesto by the *National Liberal Federation*, and signed by Sir J. Kitson,

chnadhorst, and the members of the Emergency Committee, which the mouthpiece of the Gladstonian Liberals admitted that "the result of the election had not realised the expectations of those who hoped that the country would recognise the necessity of a change in the relations of England and Ireland, and would respond to Mr. Gladstone's wise and courageous attempt to win the Irish people over to the support, not only of law and order, but of the Crown and the Imperial Government. The situation as a whole is nevertheless highly encouraging. The supporters of self-measures for Ireland are now the smallest group in Parliament. Despite the formidable coalition of forces against which he had to contend, Mr. Gladstone secured for his policy of conciliation the support of the vast majority of the Liberal electors of England, Scotland, and Wales, and of almost every Liberal organisation in the United Kingdom. That 1,338,718 electors would have recorded their votes in favour of the establishment of a legislative body in Dublin for the management of Irish affairs, as against 1,416,472 for the Unionists and Tories combined, must be regarded as a striking proof of the advance of the Home Rule movement and of the strength of the popular desire for a permanent reconciliation between the peoples of Great Britain and Ireland. So far as the Federation is concerned, the results of the appeal to the country furnish a complete justification of the course taken by the council in May last, when a resolution in support of Mr. Gladstone's policy was carried by an overwhelming majority."

Whilst regretting the withdrawal from its body of "those who, while protesting that they were in favour of Home Rule, still offered an uncompromising opposition to Mr. Gladstone's proposals," the Association had no doubt that it faithfully represented the opinion of the vast majority of the Liberal party, now finally committed to the work of effecting a real union between England and Ireland on the basis of the concession of the right of self-government to the Irish people. That task can never abandon until the goal has been reached. This Irish question occupies the first place in the politics of the day. No Government, no Parliament, no party will be able to ignore it. Until it has been settled no progress can be made with the ordinary work of the Liberal party, nor will it be possible for the Conservatives to indulge in a congenial inactivity while this problem remains unsolved. It is one of those 'unfinished questions' which have no pity for the repose of nations. It must be dealt with, and dealt with thoroughly, before the political life of the country can return to its healthy and natural course. The pretensions of the dissentient minority to impose their views on the majority cannot be defended, and they cannot be accepted. Our duty as representatives of the overwhelming majority of the Liberal electors is to use every possible means for the advancement of the principles for which we fought in the



recent contest, and to lose no opportunity of winning over to the side of a wise and generous policy of concession those Liberal who in that contest either stood aside altogether or reluctantly gave their votes to the Tory party, with the result as it has turned out of installing Lord Randolph Churchill as leader of the House of Commons." The manifesto concluded that, although the elections had ended in a momentary defeat for the advocate of a policy of conciliation, it had laid the foundation of a better understanding and a closer sympathy between the English and Irish people, and it declared that "the welfare of the country and the future of Liberalism were inseparably connected with the question of Irish self-government."

In the interval required for the re-election of the members who had accepted office, her Majesty's Ministers availed themselves of the opportunity afforded by the Lord Mayor's customary banquet (Aug. 18) to explain their position and intentions. Lord Salisbury, who was the principal speaker, said that the election had proved that all the classes of the nation had pulled together and that there was no division between the people and the classes. The differences of opinion elicited in the contest depended on geographical, not on class bias. The Metropolis, for example, in the larger sense had shown that it followed the City proper. When the City proper was in former days Liberal, the Metropolis was Liberal; the City proper having become Conservative, the Metropolis had followed in its footsteps by giving the most Conservative vote of modern times. Lord Salisbury recognised the immense strength of the desire for peace among the peoples of Europe, and hoped that there were none among the rulers of Europe who would ignore the eager wish of the various peoples for rest. To Lord Rosebery's diplomacy he did honour in the most cordial spirit. Turning to the difficulties of the Irish question, he declared that the first duty of the Government would be "to devote their whole energies to freeing the loyal people of Ireland from the constraint that is exercised upon them." "I think there is one advantage we possess over our predecessors, an advantage which I trust we shall turn to a good use. We come back as the bearers of a mandate from the people of this country, deciding, in my belief irrevocably, the question which has wrecked the peace of the neighbouring island. The question of an independent government for Ireland has been referred to the only tribunal that can determine it with authority and determine it without appeal. It has been referred to that tribunal after long and painful discussion, upon the authority of the most powerful statesman that this country has seen. It has been under these circumstances submitted to the people of this country, and they have given an answer which in itself is emphatic and unequivocal, but which is even more emphatic and unequivocal than it seems at first sight, because the view that has been heard on the side of the minority has not

influenced purely, or even to the greater extent, by a conviction of the justice of the reply that was being given. It has been influenced by the enormous, and to a great extent justly large, personal influence of the statesman to whom I have referred, and by other political considerations than those which were immediately before the country at the time."

## CHAPTER VI.

**Meeting of Parliament—Debate on the Address—Mr. Gladstone's Pamphlet—The Estimates—The Tenants' Relief Bill—Prorogation of Parliament—Lord R. Churchill at Dartford and Bradford—The Liberal Associations—Lord Salisbury at the Guildhall—Foreign Politics—Mr. John Morley in Scotland—The Unionist Liberals—Lord R. Churchill's Resignation—Disintegration of Parties.**

WHEN Parliament met for the despatch of business (Aug. 19) a short message from the Queen merely intimated that the House of Commons would be requested to vote the estimates presented by the previous Ministry, and made no reference to Irish, Indian, or foreign politics. Accordingly, in the House of Lords, the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne having been moved by the Earl of Onslow and seconded by Lord de Ros, Lord Granville at once asked Lord Salisbury why he had not waited till October to meet Parliament, since he had no policy to announce at that moment. He pressed for some general hint as to his Irish policy, and reminded him that his party had found fault with Mr. Gladstone for a delay of six weeks, whilst the present Ministry seemed to require at least six months to make up their minds. The Duke of Argyll, although rising from the same side of the House, spoke in a very different tone. He especially dwelt upon Mr. Gladstone's language in 1871, when dealing with Mr. Isaac Butt's demand for self-government. "Can any sensible man," Mr. Gladstone had then said, "can any rational man suppose that at this time of day, in the condition of this world, we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of mankind, and crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits on Ireland?" Language of this kind, argued the Duke of Argyll, did not look quite like fifteen years' suspension of judgment on Home Rule. Lord Carnarvon, after referring to the numerous versions of his relations with Mr. Parnell which had been current, declared that he had done his best to avail himself of the powers given by the law to preserve order in Ireland, but that "the law was insufficient for the purpose." Moreover, he doubted the wisdom of insisting upon giving "identical institutions to England and Ireland. Ireland does not want the same institutions, Ireland cannot bear them."

*Lord Salisbury, replying to the general criticisms aroused by the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address, pointed*

out that the credits granted to the previous Government would expire on November 1, and that had he waited until October to summon Parliament he might have been in some danger of placing the public service in a serious difficulty. Touching light on foreign affairs, he expressed his hope that with regard to the twenty miles of Afghan frontier an agreement with Russia would not be delayed; whilst he did not apprehend that the position Bulgaria seriously threatened the peace of Europe. Turning next to the condition of Ireland and the intentions of the Government towards that country, Lord Salisbury expressed the belief that, though the expired Crimes Act contained valuable provisions, the value of them had been overrated. He admitted that he might have been wrong in accepting office a year previously without being able to renew the valuable clauses of the Crimes Act, but he would not admit that he was wrong in initiating what the Duke of Argyll called "the blarney-suit of conciliation." It was Mr. Gladstone's sudden change which had altered everything. The late Prime Minister had proposed measures "which would have placed the whole machinery for the repression of crime in Ireland in the hands of those who hitherto with too good reason have been suspected of being themselves the favourers and the instigators of crime." The situation having completely altered it was necessary to study the problem before them with very great care before announcing their policy in any detail. "We were returned with one mandate—to maintain the Union. And that mandate they wished to carry out in the best possible way. Lord Salisbury then went on to say that he regarded local government as not an Irish question, but as a United Kingdom question, and held that it must be dealt with "on lines generally similar at the same time over the whole country." He proposed a commission to inquire carefully into the development of Irish fisheries and arterial drainage. With regard to social order Lord Salisbury showed that at that moment thirty-eight policemen were employed in guarding the life and property of the Earl of Kenmare, and as they cost about 100*l.* a year per man, 3,800*l.* a year was being spent in guarding one valuable life. He thought that by sending Sir Redvers Buller to Ireland, to look after the system by which outrages were dealt with in Kerry, Clare, part of Cork, and Limerick, this very expensive use of the police might be avoided. Further, the Government, though they intended to hold fast by the Act of 1881, and to enforce the law giving the landlords the judicial rents, would not scruple to inquire into the alleged inability of a certain class of tenants to pay their rents, in consequence of the supposed or real fall in the prices of produce; they would look narrowly into all combinations against rent, and learn the disposition of the tenants to buy their land. The Government would prefer to see the *duality of ownership* which the Land Act of 1881 established turned as far as possible into single ownership. And one obje

of the Irish Commission to be appointed to inquire into this question would be to show how it was possible to promote single ownerships and peasant proprietorships. The Address was then agreed to, and the House of Lords separated.

In the House of Commons, after a preliminary skirmish over the sessional orders raised by Mr. Bradlaugh, the Address was moved by Col. King Harman, who now sat as Conservative member for the Isle of Thanet Division of Kent, and seconded by Mr. J. M. McLean, who at Oldham had defeated at the last election Mr. J. T. Hibbert, a greatly respected member of Mr. Gladstone's Government.

Mr. Gladstone then rose, and in a speech of great tranquillity and dignity asserted his firm and even growing conviction that the Irish policy of the late Government was conceived wholly on the right lines. He congratulated the Government heartily on having announced no policy of coercion, even though, so far as he could judge, there was more excuse for such a policy now than in January last, when Parliament was asked to give special powers for putting down the National League. He hinted that this proved the policy of coercion to be at an end; and with every admission that coercion would not be applied again, he thought that Home Rule for Ireland came nearer. Mr. Gladstone urged the Government to announce its Irish policy before the winter, and pointed out the great danger of allowing the present favourable moment to pass by, and letting a new "No-rent" cry go forth without having settled the Irish question while circumstances favoured the measure.

There was much curiosity to see how Lord R. Churchill would acquit himself in his new position, and the general verdict when he sat down was decidedly favourable. He managed to be discreet without dulness, and aggressive without bitterness. As to Mr. Gladstone's criticism on the difference of the position taken up by the Conservatives since January, he reminded the House that in the interval Mr. Gladstone had taken the lead of the National party in Ireland, and had brought over to the cause of the repeal of the Union a large proportion of a great historic party. The late Government, he said, had been of opinion that the three questions, social order, the land question, and local government, were indissolubly connected, and their policy was to deal with them all by one measure. Lord R. Churchill declared that the policy of the Conservative Government was to treat them to a very large extent as totally separate and distinct. They would enforce the existing laws which did not warrant or excuse any serious disturbance of social order, they would give the land laws which owed their existence to Mr. Gladstone some chance of proving their usefulness, and they would treat the question of local government as a question for the whole United Kingdom. With regard to the state of Ireland, Lord R. Churchill declared that it was only Kerry and the surrounding

districts which were specially disturbed, for the outbreak of rioting in Belfast was only spasmodic, and the energetic measures adopted to restore peace would, he trusted, prove availing. To meet the difficulties in the West and South-West of Ireland, Sir Redvers Buller, directly responsible to the Chief Secretary, would be sent to put an end to the reign of terror. Further, a Royal Commission would be appointed to inquire into the working of the Land Acts of 1881 and 1885, and to report to what extent the provisions of the latter Act might be expedited and extended, especially in congested districts, by providing security through the intervention of local authorities. A second Royal Commission, he added, amid the laughter of the Home Rulers, would be appointed to inquire into the material resources of Ireland, and would advise whether by the outlay of public money those resources could be developed and the energies of the people stimulated. With regard to local government, he went on to say: "When Parliament reassembles in February the Government are sanguine that they will be prepared with definite proposals on that large question. Their object will be as far as possible, to eliminate party feelings, and to secure for the consideration of the question as large an amount of Parliamentary co-operation as can be obtained, so that whatever settlement may be arrived at, it may not be claimed as a triumph for either party. . . . The great signposts of our policy are equality, similarity, and simultaneity as far as possible in the development of a genuinely popular system of local government in the four countries which form the United Kingdom." The debate on the Address was prolonged over twelve nights, in the course of which numerous amendments were proposed, but all were defeated by majorities varying from 75 to 125. In the first instance, the object of the speakers was merely to put on record before the House the views which induced them to support or oppose the new Ministry. Sir William Harcourt, for example (Aug. 20), took direct issue with Lord R. Churchill on his interpretation of the intentions of the late Administration and maintained that it was a fundamental principle of the Liberal party that social order depended on the removal of the grounds out of which social disorder arose. He retorted on Lord R. Churchill (who had suggested that Mr. Gladstone's anticipation of a "No-rent" cry might be taken as a hint) that his language was an incentive to landlords to exact the uttermost farthing. He likened the Government in its fancy for commissions to the artist, mentioned by Canning, who held that the only thing that it was worth the while of an artist to paint was a red lion. In large pictures, cabinet pictures, frescoes, and what not he always suggested a red lion. So the present Government suggested everywhere Royal Commissions, large or small, as the case might be. On a later day (Aug. 23) the Irish Secretary (Sir M. Hicks-Beach) explained his view of his duties



at that juncture. He said that when the Government was charged with encouraging outrages and promoting disturbances in Ireland—when it was said they were prepared to turn loose the military upon the tenants at the bidding of the landlords, these were charges for which, if they were true, the Ministers deserved to be impeached. The Government's policy was, however, a sober one. It had for its object the social and moral welfare of Ireland; moreover, they were earnestly eager to obtain some rest from that ceaseless political agitation which had disturbed the country so long. When Sir William Harcourt had urged that social disorder could never be treated except in concert with the redress of grievances out of which the social disorder springs, it should be remembered that he had not waited for the passing of a Crofters' Bill before he sent gunboats and marines to put down disorder in the Isle of Skye. Were rioting in Belfast and moonlighting in Kerry to be permitted to go on until the constituencies had returned a House of Commons which would adopt a policy favoured by Sir William Harcourt? Instead of moving an amendment to the Address Sir William had stabbed the Government in the back with misrepresentations of their policy by charging Lord Randolph Churchill with inciting landlords to exact full rents, and with precipitating evictions. In fact, Sir William had chalked "No rent" on the wall, and had then run away.

As for the present Government, he described its policy to be a sober policy, intended to give Ireland rest after a policy of constant agitation. In defending his commissions, which were made the occasion for incessant jeers from the Irish party, the Chief Secretary said that it was simply impossible to know without careful inquiry whether the facts asserted as to the great fall in the yield of all Irish produce since the judicial rents were fixed were or were not true, and that it was impossible to know without inquiry what might be done to stimulate other industries. But Sir W. Harcourt's speech, he said, had amounted to this—that because Home Rule could not be granted, "moonlighting" in Kerry should go on. Sir Michael held that a very moderate expenditure, perhaps three quarters of a million, on arterial drainage might do great things for Ireland, but the Government could not undertake it without the advice of responsible men of large experience, accurately informed. As for the local government scheme, the Government were well aware that it would not satisfy Irish demands for self-government, but none the less they would do their best, within the lines of the Union, to leave Ireland in a more peaceful and prosperous condition than that in which they had found it. Sir Michael deprecated earnestly the notion that they desired to see the landlords pressing tenants for rents, judicial or otherwise, which in spite of steady work they had not been able to sell crops or stock to provide.

After a few unimportant speeches Lord Hartington rose to

defend himself and his friends from the charge of being no longer Liberals because they were unable to accept certain opinions with regard to the government of Ireland, and to protest against the attack made upon Lord R. Churchill. He remarked in passing that the Parnellite party could not be expected to wish for the restoration of social order in Ireland till they had gained the political purpose on which their hearts were set. It was impossible for that group to desire that even fair rents should be punctually and peacefully paid, till such changes should have been made as they approved in the Irish machinery for legislation and administration. But Sir William Harcourt at least need not have insisted that nothing could be done to enforce the law more adequately till a statutory Parliament had been given to Ireland. He at least had not held this view long. In his speech, in 1882, in favour of putting down resistance to the law, he said nothing about the absolute necessity of accompanying the enforcement of the law with the redress of grievances. As for the allegation that the judicial rents could not possibly be paid, if the late Government believed it, why did they base the valuation of the land on twenty years' purchase of the net rental, without any regard to that enormous reduction in the economic rental which they now alleged? The late Government had never suggested that evictions should be suspended; and yet if the proposals of the late Government had come into operation, the November evictions would have occurred this year just as they would now, since the Land Purchase Bill could not have come into operation so soon. Lord Hartington gravely condemned the interpretation put on some of the speeches of the Government, as if they had invited the Irish landlords to press on evictions without any regard to reason, moderation, or mercy. He approved of the investigations announced by the Government, and utterly declined to find in them the absurd and exaggerated inferences as to the action they intended to take which had been drawn in Parliament by the Irish and Opposition speakers.

The night's debate was closed by Mr. John Morley, who in a somewhat bitter tone declared that he could see little in Lord Hartington's attitude to encourage the hope that the embarrassment and divisions that had so distressed and perplexed the country were likely soon to come to an end. As to the name of Liberal, what Mr. Morley and his friends claimed was that a new and a great emergency had arisen, and that they thought they were applying to it the old Liberal principles, and they would certainly spare no efforts to convert the constituencies to their way of thinking. With regard to the Government's announcement, they were in this dilemma: either they made a mistake in January when they asked for coercion, or they were making a mistake now when not doing so, though the circumstances were similar. In either case it was difficult to avoid a

rious suspicion of political levity. Quoting statistics, he said that where there were most evictions there the outrages were most numerous. He did not argue that evictions were an excuse for outrages; but they were an explanation of outrages, and proved that the root of the social disorder was somewhere or other to be found in the agrarian question. In reality the Government were going to take measures to stop outrage on the one hand, and to encourage evictions on the other. In every line of Lord Randolph Churchill's speech there was an assurance to the landlords that they would have the uttermost nothing wrung for them from the tenants. It appeared to him very doubtful whether any good would come from the appointment of General Buller, for the real evil was one which no general could touch. It was that the public opinion of the district was against the restoration of order and in favour of the concealment of the midnight marauders from the officers of justice. The effectual remedy to be tried was self-government. Mr. Morley then asked the Ministry to make up their mind as to whether Mr. Gladstone's proposed legislation had made the position of the Government easier or more difficult with regard to social order. The former had been maintained by Lord Randolph Churchill as a reason for not asking for coercion, and the latter had been maintained by Sir M. Hicks-Beach, when he took up his task of governing Ireland. In Mr. Morley's opinion

Irish people were showing a measure of patience such as had never been known before, because they knew that Mr. Gladstone's proposals were still, not in the letter but in the spirit, supported by him and by an enormous mass of Englishmen. As to the proposed Commission, it was to see whether there should be a Land Bill at all; the Liberal Commission had been issued as a preliminary to a Bill. As the Commission would be told to inquire whether a fall in prices had made the rents too high, this would encourage the landlord to extort the uttermost thing, and the tenant not to pay his rent. A suggestion made

by Mr. Morley was that a tenant should be enabled to go to those tribunals to which a landlord went for an ejectment—namely the county courts—and to plead circumstances which would excuse him, for a time at least, from having the extreme process of eviction enforced against him. Unless some such thing were done there would unquestionably be serious peril of very great social disturbances. He asked whether it had been forgotten that only last year there was a Committee on Irish Industries, and that not one jot or tittle could be added to the evidence taken by it. With that evidence there was only one committee needed to deal, and that was her Majesty's Government. At this first stage he protested against Parliament and the British Government undertaking a vast expenditure, which the Irish members could not effectually supervise, on public works on which they had not been consulted. Though

the Government might talk of decentralisation, they were going to give new life to the centralised system, for the Treasury would not issue these vast sums without Treasury control. With regard to local government he could not reconcile Lord Hartington's recent statements with his acquiescence in the Government's meagre proposals :—

“The mandate of the constituencies was (he said in conclusion) unfavourable to our proposals ; but their judgment was in favour of the course that the Government of the day, of whom soever it might be composed, should take in hand as soon as possible the reconstruction of the Irish Government on the broadest lines compatible with Parliamentary supremacy. It is inevitable that circumstances will force you to take the task in hand in that wide sense and with that wide interpretation. Nay, further, I say that the moment you advance along the road, the road which I believe the English and Scotch constituencies wish to go, you will have to travel as far as we wish you to travel, and to bring in proposals which, however different they may be in detail, will be, in spirit and in principle, identical with those which we have proposed.”

On the following day (Aug. 24) Mr. Parnell joined in the debate with a specific amendment. In a clear dispassionate speech he explained his reasons for believing that Mr. Gladstone's Government would have had a majority in the election had they had three weeks longer for agitating the country. He indulged the hope that “after the present Government have exhibited themselves as a spectacle for gods and men for a year or two in their attempt to govern Ireland,” the opinion of the British people would change, and come round to Home Rule. He stated that the present Government had declared it to be their policy to substitute single ownership for dual ownership in Ireland and that this would cost the British taxpayers an enormous sum. Mr. Parnell disclaimed all responsibility for Lord Ashbourne's Act, declaring that he approved it only so long as he believed the Tory Government to be intending to supplement it with a Home Rule measure ; and he declared that the State would not now be guaranteed from loss under that Act. He counselled moderation and patience to the people in one sentence, but he also predicted that though the people would probably be patient, yet “the incitements which are being addressed to landlords would bear fruit.” “More evictions will take place, and exasperation will follow. . . . The Irish people will never submit to be governed by a Government which is not their own.” Finally he advised the Government to have a “triennial revision of rents,” and to make them vary with the price of produce. He expected, however, a coercion secretly administered, “a coercion worthy of the name,” accompanied by the imprisonment of political opponents in Ireland, and followed by suspensions of the Irish representatives in England. He concluded by movin

an address to the Crown representing the great loss to the farmers caused by the fall in the price of Irish produce, and the consequent impossibility of paying the rents recently settled.

Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Plunket rose immediately after Mr. Parnell sat down, and the latter having refused to give way, Mr. Gladstone had to wait his turn. On rising to speak, however, he was met by a question of order raised by Lord R. Churchill, which was supported by the Speaker. Mr. Gladstone having already exhausted his right to speak on any other topic than that raised by Mr. Parnell's amendment, it was only by the indulgence of the House, for which Lord R. Churchill appealed in his behalf, that Mr. Gladstone was able to make the second speech on the general policy of the Government. The ex-Premier prefaced his remarks by saying that it was not his intention to take any part in the division on Mr. Parnell's amendment. The chances of legislation before the following spring were so remote that it would be better to await the report of the commission on rents. Much more formidable than the question of land purchase was that of land rents. "Here the doctrine has been laid down, and we ought to know from the Government without delay, whether this doctrine is to be maintained or not, that in cases where the judicial rents are extravagant the tenant is to be charged the real rentable value, and that the landlord is to be paid on the basis of the judicial rent, and the difference is to be found by the State. Whether the Government will carry that into law or not I will not ask, for no power on earth, or within these walls or beyond them, will ever succeed in carrying into law such a proposition. It establishes a distinction between judicial and other rents in respect to the title of the land which we never have admitted, and never can. In giving to tenants the means of obtaining judicial rents we proceeded on this principle—that in Ireland, owing to abnormal social circumstances, the market for land has not been a fair market, but it has been one in which land was the only method of subsistence offered to the people, and in consequence unnatural rents had in many instances been given and taken for land."

After dealing with the question of judicial rents at some length, Mr. Gladstone next passed on to consider Lord Hartington's conditions as to the government of Ireland. He declared that they were based one and all on the assumption that there was to be one central body governing and legislating in Ireland for certain enumerated purposes. And he asked, "Did Lord Hartington adhere to that policy? Would the Government entertain that principle, and try whether by its adoption they could establish a *modus vivendi* between themselves and the Irish people? These plans for local government need not be affected by the commissions. But he was quite at a loss to understand how the Government should find it necessary, in the month of August, to postpone to February their measure



with regard to local government. Sir M. Hicks-Beach had said the difficulties of governing Ireland had been much increased by the propositions of the late Government, but Lord R. Churchill thought coercion unnecessary because the late Government had become the leaders of the Nationalists, and legality would now be the rule in Ireland. "Gentlemen seem ready to catch at the imputation of having become the leaders of the Nationalists in Ireland, as if that were a serious charge against the late Government. For my part I am delighted to have had any share or part whatever in becoming either leader or follower—I care not which—in any movement that tends by soothing the people of Ireland and by encouraging them to hope for the realisation of their just claims—I am delighted to think that we should have had a share, according to the noble lord, who gives us in his bounty a very large share indeed, if not the whole, in establishing better ideas with regard to legality in Ireland. But this must say. It is not in our power to answer for the state of Ireland as long as you choose to continue a system under which you have this sad fact staring you in the face—that whereas law in England is administered in an English spirit, and law in Scotland in a Scotch spirit, law in Ireland is not administered in an Irish spirit. With that state of facts staring you in the face we may teach legality—and we shall teach it to the best of our power—but you cannot give security to social order in Ireland."

Among the other speeches on Mr. Parnell's amendment which the prolonged debate drew forth, that of Mr. Chamberlain (Aug. 26) was most noteworthy. He condemned the amendment as incomplete and inconclusive. Its terms were too general, and he did not believe that the tenants were generally unable to pay their rents with the present prices of produce. The second part of the amendment was in the nature of an anticipatory repudiation of a policy which found no place in the Queen's Speech, and the existence of which was denied by the Government. He was not going to vote for an amendment the carrying of which would be equivalent to a vote of censure on the Government. He would do nothing to turn out the Government so long as the Government which would take its place was committed to Separatist policy. The amendment might be described as an unnecessary affirmative and a gratuitous negative. He wished to know whether the Separatist Liberals were going to vote for the amendment, and reminded them that Mr. Gladstone had declared that he would not support it. The fact was that they could never settle the Irish question satisfactorily without the creation of a great scheme of peasant proprietorship, and they could only do that by a vast confiscation of the property of individuals, or by a great system of State-aided purchase. The latter was the only practical alternative; but he had opposed the scheme of Mr. Gladstone because it involved the risk of tremendous loss

and because he objected to advancing money to Ireland unless she remained an integral part of the United Kingdom. As to the Government proposals, they were not open to the ridicule which had been cast upon them; and as to judicial rents, he thought they ought to be maintained. Because the policy of the Government had for its object the assertion of law against lawlessness, the promotion of the material prosperity and happiness of the Irish people, and the maintenance of the Union, he was prepared to wait till it was developed, and when developed to give it fair and favourable consideration.

On the following evening (Aug. 27) Mr. Sexton made no attempt to disguise the policy which he should urge his fellow-countrymen to adopt in the presence of unforeseen agricultural distress. He bitterly criticised the defence of the Government policy put forward by Mr. Chamberlain, who, he asserted, had shown himself more Tory than the Tories themselves. The commissions which were to be appointed, he was convinced, could never come to anything, for the question of the maintenance of the constitution in Ireland and the right of the Irish people to remain in their homes would have been decided before the Government policy was developed. The Irish members would stand so far as they could by their own people, and would counsel them to stand by one another, heedless of threats against combination. In the presence of the intimation of the Government that the payment of full rents would be evidence before the Royal Commission, and would stand upon the face of their reports as proof that rents which were manifestly intolerable were not so high, the Irish members would not place themselves in the position of estate bailiffs and rent collectors for the Irish landlords by assisting their people to pauperise themselves in order to create an argument to their own ruin.

Sir W. Harcourt also, who in conjunction with Mr. J. Morley was holding the leadership of the Opposition, made Mr. Chamberlain's speech the special object of his attack, and asked whether the Government indorsed the views of their chief supporter. It would seem that he was the real author and director of their policy, and, they having yet only half learned their lesson, it was necessary that he should explain away the blunders they made. If the right honourable gentleman thought to coerce the Liberal party into a signpost of Tory policy by threatening them with forty years' wandering in the wilderness unless they abandoned their principles, he little understood the spirit of those whom he addressed. In face of the state of things in Ireland, as to which evidence was already before the House in the reports of Mr. Tuke and of the Commission on Trade, what were the Government going to do? There were people who could not wait while a commission of inquiry was pursuing its investigations. With regard to the land purchase scheme of the Government, he held that the Liberal Unionists, by their action

at the last election, had destroyed all chance of any Land Purchase Bill being passed. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach declined state what measures the Government would propose until they knew what were the results of the inquiry which they intended to institute. As to the amendment, he maintained that the prices generally were not so low in Ireland as to make a general payment of judicial rents impossible, though he admitted that the rents in particular districts might be too high. The Government did not take the view that inability to pay was the sole ground for non-payment of rents, and if non-payment arose from unwillingness, fortified perhaps by terrorism, it would be unjust for Parliament to fine the landlords. With regard to land purchase when the commission of inquiry had reported the Government would approach the question with a determination to do justice to all the interests affected, including those of the British taxpayer. The House then divided, the numbers being:—For the amendment, 181; against the amendment, 304; the amendment being thus defeated by 123. The majority included 46 Liberal Unionists, whilst Mr. Parnell, in spite of the fair words of his English friends, was unable to secure the vote of any prominent ex-Ministerialist.

Immediately after his speech Mr. Gladstone had left England for a tour in Bavaria, but before his departure he issued a pamphlet on the Irish question, divided into two parts: (1) History of an Idea, and (2) Lessons of the Elections. In the former part he pointed out that his language and conduct, "governed by uniformity of principle, have followed the several stages by which the great question of autonomy for Ireland has been brought to a state of ripeness for practical legislation." The conditions under which alone he considered Home Rule possible were briefly, (1) the abandonment of the hope that Parliament could serve as a passable legislative instrument for Ireland; (2) the unequivocal and constitutional demand of the Irish members, unaccompanied by any danger to the unity and security of the empire; and (3) the possibility of dealing with Scotland in a similar way in circumstances of equal or equally clear desires.

In reply to the charge of having "sprung" Home Rule on his colleagues and supporters—of having conceived it precipitately, as argued by Lord Hartington, and concealed it unduly, as pressed by Mr. Bright—Mr. Gladstone replied that it was not the duty of every Minister to make known, even to his colleagues, every idea which had formed itself in his mind. "What is true," he added, "is that I had not publicly, as in principle condemned it, and also that I had mentally considered it." It had not become the unequivocal demand of Ireland, and it had not been so defined by its promoters as to prove that it was a safe demand. Mr. Gladstone then went to point out that during all the earlier years of his public life the alternatives were *repeal on the one hand, and on the other the relief of Ireland*

from grievances. It was in 1871, he added, that he took the first step "towards placing the controversy on its true basis." He opposed Mr. Butt's scheme because the second of the above alternatives had not been exhausted; but even at that time "he did not close the door against a recognition of the question in a different state of things." Similarly, in 1874, Mr. Gladstone "accepted without qualification the principle that Home Rule had no necessary connection with separation." Again, when in 1880 Mr. Shaw took up the question, Mr. Gladstone hailed his speech as "showing an evident disposition to respect the functions of the House and the spirit of the Constitution." In 1881, speaking at the Guildhall, he had declared that he "would hail with satisfaction and delight any measure of local government for Ireland." Finally, in the election campaign of the previous autumn, Mr. Gladstone maintained that his great object had been to do nothing to hinder the prosecution of the question by the Tories, but to use his best efforts to impress the public mind with the importance and urgency of the question. It was in this spirit that the Midlothian address was written. The Irish question was severed from the general subject of local government; and it was pointed out that it would probably throw into the shade all the other important measures which were as ripe for legislation.

In the second part of his pamphlet Mr. Gladstone discussed the "Lessons of the Elections," estimating that the defection of the Unionists represented a loss to the Liberal party of two-sevenths of its full strength; but, although it carried with it five-sixths of the Liberal peers, it did not influence more than one-twentieth of the Liberal working-men. Of the four nationalities within the United Kingdom, Scotland approved his Irish policy by three to two, Ireland by four and a half to one, and "gallant Wales" by five to one—returning in the aggregate 150 supporters against 50 opponents—whilst England "decided against Ireland" by returning 336 opponents to 129 supporters.

Mr. Gladstone then went to show that the Unionists were already "pledged to immediate and large concession; many of them on such a scale that they give to their idea the name of Home Rule, declaring themselves favourable to its principle, and only opposed to the awkward and perverse manner in which it was handled by the late Administration." "Look at the question," Mr. Gladstone continued, "which way we will, the cause of Irish self-government lives and moves, and can hardly fail to receive more life and more propulsion from the hands of those who have been its successful opponents in one of its particular forms. It will arise as a wounded warrior sometimes arises on the field of battle, and stabs to the heart some soldier of the victorious army who has been exulting over him." After referring in severe terms to those who described his policy as one of *separation*, and declaring that none but a few fanatics of crime

now dreamt of separation, Mr. Gladstone expressed his firm conviction that the most powerful cause of the defeat of his policy was the aversion to the Land Purchase Bill. This aversion, he said, grew out of misapprehension, which was itself founded on misrepresentations such as the complexity of the subject made it impossible to remove. He therefore thought it his duty "explicitly to acknowledge that the sentence which has gone forth for the severance of the two measures is irresistible, and that the twinship, which has been for the time disastrous to the hopes of Ireland, exists no longer. At the same time, the partnership between enemies of Home Rule and enemies of the Land Bill, which has brought about this result, will now, we may hope, be dissolved." The main object of the Bill had been to get rid of the bad and dangerous schemes which alone had seemed possible in the centralised condition of the government of Ireland. He claimed Conservative favour for his Bill, as it was especially founded on regard for history and tradition, and aimed in the main at restoring, not at altering, the Empire. He next posed the question, "To which party is the work reserved?" but, in reply, did not go beyond the expression of undoubted belief that a measure of self-government not less extensive than the proposal of 1886 would be ultimately carried, "nor is it for me to conjecture whether in this, as in so many other cases, the enemies of the measure are the persons designed finally to guide its triumphal procession to the Capitol." And he concluded: "If I am not egregiously wrong in all that has been said, Ireland has now lying before her a broad and even way in which to walk to the consummation of her wishes. Before her eyes is opened that same path of constitutional and peaceful action, of steady, free, and full discussion, which has led England and Scotland to the achievement of all their pacific triumphs." Although the pamphlet obtained a wide circulation as soon as it appeared in a popular form, it did not excite much criticism from either friends or foes. It was interpreted generally as an invitation to the Liberal Unionists to return to their allegiance, by minimising the points of difference between the various sections of the party.

In this expectation he was, however, for the time disappointed, and nothing occurred during the session to show that the Unionists entertained the least idea of withdrawing their support from an Administration which had been installed in office with their full connivance and approval. For instance, in the prolonged debate on the Address, Mr. S. Smith's amendment, expressing regret at the continuance of the war in Burma, and protesting against its cost being borne solely by India, was defeated (Aug. 30) by 199 to 126; and another by Dr. Clark, declaring the condition of affairs in the Highlands and islands of Scotland to be unsatisfactory, was rejected (Aug. 31) by 203 to 121. A more protracted debate arose on Mr. Sexton's amend-



ment on the Address, praying her Majesty to confine authority in Belfast to magistrates "directly responsible to her Majesty's Government," and to increase the local constabulary to such an extent "as may enable it to deal with any probable contingency." He discoursed for two hours on the necessity of acting, without waiting for the report of the Commission of Inquiry, and sharply attacked Lord Iddesleigh, Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Randolph Churchill—especially the latter—as having instigated the Orange party to acts of violence. Lord Randolph had, he said, incited the Orangemen to revolt after the passing of a Home Rule Bill, and Mr. Chamberlain had incited them to revolt before its passing. The chief burden of Mr. Sexton's argument was that the Orangemen had been solely to blame in the Belfast disturbances, and that the Roman Catholics and the Nationalists had been always the attacked, not the attacking party. Sir M. Hicks-Beach, on behalf of the Government, replied that it was impossible to assume the correct answers to questions which were being carefully sifted by the Commission. He entirely exonerated the Mayor of Belfast, Sir E. Harland, from the charge of any sort of partisanship; and he criticised as very quaint Mr. Sexton's impatience to get rid entirely of Home Rule in Belfast, and to put order in Belfast directly under the authorities of the Castle, as a preliminary to establishing Home Rule in Ireland and putting Ireland under the very *régime* which, in the commercial capital of Ireland, he found unendurable. Mr. T. W. Russell put the Protestant view of the Belfast riots before the House in reply to Mr. Sexton's Nationalist view, though he did not attempt to exonerate the Protestants so completely as Mr. Sexton attempted to exonerate the Roman Catholics.

The resumption of the debate (Sept. 2) was characterised by a series of incidents, which somewhat relieved the monotony of the proceedings, the Speaker having occasion to call Colonel Saunderson twice to order, Sir William Harcourt three times, and twice insisting on an apology from Mr. W. Redmond. Colonel Saunderson justified, not forcible resistance to a Home Rule Act, but forcible resistance to any gross injustice by an Irish Parliament which might result from the passing of such an Act; and he termed the probable Government under such an Act, a government by "gaol-birds," because Mr. Davitt had said that it would be completely in the hands of the suspects whom Mr. Forster locked up in prison in 1881 (but who, as they were never tried, ought not, it was said, to be called "gaol-birds," a "gaol-bird" being properly a person on whom a legal sentence of imprisonment has been passed). Mr. John Morley retorted that if Colonel Saunderson acted on his own doctrine, he would soon become, in his own person, a "gaol-bird." He then went on to deliver a very temperate and forcible defence of his own administration during the Belfast riots, concluding an eloquent speech with the hope that *Irishmen of all ranks, religions, and stations*

would unite together to give Ireland a strong Government. After a violent speech from Mr. W. Redmond, Sir W. Harcourt made a fierce attack on the Orangemen, as "the curse of Ireland" in the course of which he was called upon thrice by the Speaker to confine himself more closely to the question before the House. He further accused Lord Randolph Churchill of going to Belfast on purpose to inflame the passions of these Orangemen. In the end, Mr. Sexton's amendment was rejected by a majority of 225 against 128, without eliciting any speech from Lord Randolph Churchill. Then the Address was agreed to without division; but, on the Report being brought up, Mr. Parnell moved that the Report be taken at the next sitting of the House. The Chancellor of the Exchequer protested against the waste of time, but a long and acrimonious wrangle ensued, the Speaker having to intervene more than once, and at last the Government was obliged to give way. The Report on the Address was, after two more nights' debate, finally (Sept. 3) agreed to, and the House settled down to the discussion of the Estimates. The most important points raised, apart from those connected with Ireland, were those referring to the ordnance provided for the navy and the arms supplied to the troops. It was argued that the responsibility of the "guns which burst, the bayonets that bent, and the cartridges that jammed" rested with the Ordnance Department, which in its turn passed on the blame to the badness of the steel employed. Captain Price expressed (Sept. 7) in strong terms the public feeling on the subject, that the whole source of our failures was the tripartite alliance between the War Office, Woolwich, and Elswick, and that nothing which did not proceed from that circle stood any chance of being favourably considered by the ordnance authorities. Mr. Woodall, who had held the post of Surveyor-General of the Ordnance under Mr. Gladstone, undertook the defence of the department, and traversed the adverse criticisms which had fallen from various quarters of the House; but his testimony was somewhat weakened by the summary way in which his colleague, Mr. R. W. Duff, representing the Board of Admiralty in the same Administration, desired it to be clearly understood that his Board could not be in any way responsible for the guns supplied to the navy. Mr. W. Smith, on behalf of the Government, announced his intention to appoint a committee—"a judicial committee, with the object of providing a complete answer for the satisfaction of the country" as to the way things had during the previous five years been administered by the Ordnance Department. With this assurance, the Army Estimates were, after some further discussion, voted. In like manner the Navy Estimates, after more practical discussion, leading to the promise of certain definite reforms, were agreed to. Simultaneously with the discussion of the Civil Service Estimates, the promised Bill for the discontinuance of the annual grant of 10,000*l.* for the Sec

Service Fund was brought forward. This sum had hitherto been paid out of the Consolidated Fund, and had consequently, unlike the secret service money voted for foreign services, escaped Parliamentary control. It was paid over quarterly to the Political Secretary of the Treasury, and by him disbursed without explanation or responsibility. The bulk of it was avowedly employed for party purposes; and as there was no need for the surrender of the unexpended balance at the close of each financial year, it was probable that at the eve of a general election, especially if the party in power had held office for some time, a considerable fund would be in hand for assisting party candidates. To Lord Randolph Churchill and Mr. Labouchere was due in great measure the protest, which was loudly echoed by the public, against this survival of the old days of Parliamentary corruption. Shortly before his retirement from office, Mr. Gladstone had promised that the matter should be considered; but it was left to his political rivals to carry its reform (Sept. 3) through the House of Commons, and subsequently (Sept. 20) through the House of Lords.

Although the debates on the Civil Service Estimates, and especially on the Irish votes, were discussed at somewhat greater length than the results justified, the tact and temper displayed by the new leader of the House warded off any very evident displays of party feeling. It was rather in the press than in Parliament that Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Morley were accused of not keeping in proper subordination their Irish allies, especially as the promise to give up Government time to the consideration of Mr. Parnell's Land Bill was regarded by many of the Irish members themselves as an equivalent for some waiving of their rights of discussing the Estimates in detail. It was, in fact, round their Bill that all the interest of the remainder of the session centred. The first intimation of this proposal had been made by Mr. Parnell almost as soon as the debate on the Address had concluded, and Lord R. Churchill moved (Sept. 3) to give Supply preference over all other business. Mr. Dillon first endeavoured to pledge the House to the discussion of some remedial measures for Ireland in view of the existing agricultural distress. Sir William Harcourt, whilst declining to vote for this resolution, gave it his strongest support; but it was strongly opposed by Sir M. Hicks-Beach, who maintained that the situation in Ireland was not so urgent as represented, and that, apart from political agitation, there was no reason to anticipate a disturbed winter. Mr. Parnell thereupon rose, and, in a speech of the most carefully marked moderation, declared that the economic prospect for the winter was much more serious than it was in 1880, when crime multiplied so rapidly; that he and his friends did not for a moment contemplate such an agitation as they set on foot in 1880, but that there was every reason why such a Bill as the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, which they introduced as a private

Bill in 1880, and which was afterwards taken up by Mr. Forster, should be introduced; and he declared that he would be satisfied if only the Government would promise to find time for its introduction and serious discussion before the introduction of the Appropriation Bill, since he really hoped to get the assent of the House to its main provisions—the inclusion of leaseholds in the Land Act of 1881; the revision of rents at short intervals, in proportion to the price of produce; and the grant of a power to the Courts to stay ejectments in the case of tenants who had paid three-quarters of their judicial rent. He made an earnest appeal to the House not to let “the golden moments” pass. The condition of Ireland during the winter would depend on their decision. Neither he nor any of the popular leaders would be able to hold back the wave of violence if the Irish people were driven to desperation by the prospect of wholesale ejectments.

In answer to this appeal, Lord R. Churchill said that, although he could not hold out any hope that the Government would accept Mr. Parnell’s Bill, yet they admitted his responsibility, and promised that, if Mr. Parnell thought good would be done in Ireland by having such a measure brought forward and discussed in the House, he would undertake to find the necessary time. It was round this Bill that the remaining interest of the session centred. As originally foreshadowed, its principal feature was to give power to the Land Court to stay eviction when the tenant had paid to his landlord 75 per cent. of the judicial rent, and to leave the remainder to be the subject of subsequent legal settlement. This reduction was based upon what had been voluntarily made by a number of “good” landlords, in view of the fall in the value of agricultural produce and it was calculated to represent roughly the difference between the tenant’s profit in a good and in a bad year. When first mooted, it was rumoured that the Cabinet, influenced by Lord R. Churchill and Mr. H. Matthews (the Home Secretary), were in favour of meeting Mr. Parnell’s proposals on this point in conciliatory spirit, but that Lord Hartington made the support of the Unionists dependent upon a distinct refusal to make terms with the Irish Nationalists. As Lord Salisbury could not dispense with Lord Hartington’s aid to carry on the Government, he was forced to accept his terms, and it was decided that Mr. Parnell’s Bill should be altogether rejected. The Conservatives, moreover, it was urged, were pledged to inquiry before legislation, and to assent to the Bill would be to prejudge questions remitted to the Commission. The result of this decision upon the framers of the measure was at once apparent when the text of the Bill appeared. In the first draft it proposed—(1) to admit leaseholders to the benefits of the Land Act (2) to empower the landlord or tenant to appeal to the Court to alter the already determined (for fifteen years) judicial rent

and (3) to give power to the Land Court to stay eviction when the tenant had paid "such a proportion of his rent as, in the opinion of the Court, is just, considering the circumstances of the case. The actual percentage of reduction would thus have been left to the discretion of the Court; but some of the leading Liberals of Mr. Gladstone's following professed to see elements of danger in a proposal which could only weaken the influence of the Courts, which their leader had set up to pronounce authoritatively between landlords and tenants. They preferred, therefore, to see Parliament define the deduction to be made from judicial rents; and, by their advice or influence, Mr. Parnell eventually fixed upon 50 per cent. of the rent as the amount which, if paid to the landlord, should prevent evictions being enforced. He, moreover, enlarged the scope of his Bill so as to include leaseholders of all kinds as well as "judicial" tenants. The actual production, however, of the Bill in any authoritative shape was delayed until it could be ascertained whether Mr. Gladstone proposed to take part in the debate. An assurance to this effect having been obtained, on the day after his return to England the debate on the second reading was taken (Sept. 20) with the consent of the Government.

Mr. Parnell then explained the ultimate form in which he proposed the Tenants' Relief Bill to the consideration of the House. In opening a somewhat dull and unimpassioned speech, the Nationalist leader asserted that, if the general election had resulted in a mandate against self-government for Ireland, it had also resulted in a mandate that this House of Commons should do as much to remedy the grievances of Ireland as a Parliament of her own would; and, late as the season might be, the energies of a young and fresh Parliament should be equal to the urgency of the occasion. The measure, he said, consisted of three provisions. The first was that any statutory tenant whose rent had been fixed prior to the last day of 1884 might apply to the Land Commission to have his rent abated on condition that he paid half the rent due and half the arrears, and that he showed that he was unable to pay the remainder of his rent without depriving himself of the means of cultivating and stocking his holding. The second part of the Bill enabled leaseholders to apply at once to have a statutory rent fixed without waiting for the expiration of their leases, and the third section of the Bill suspended proceedings for the recovery of rent on payment of half the rent and arrears. The measure, he said, was a temporary one to meet a temporary emergency, and applied only to the existing rent and that of next year; for, though he feared that the fall in prices would be permanent, he could not now prove it. Arguing the question of the fall in prices, he went in detail through the returns as to the principal products, *contending that the fall all round was more than 20 per cent., and for this reason the Land Act of 1881 had con-*



ferred no benefits on the tenants, who would have been better off without the Act and with their old prices. Next he showed that the Land Courts were recognising this fall, inasmuch as their standard of the reduction of rents had been 9·5 per cent. under the Poor Law valuation this year, whereas before the beginning of the year it was 9 per cent. above that valuation, and he went at length into the figures of evictions, which he predicted must, according to all precedent, increase in the coming winter.

Mr. Penrose Fitzgerald, an Irish Conservative sitting for an English constituency (Cambridge), moved the rejection of the Bill on the ground that it was not advisable to reopen the land question—a line of argument in which he was followed by Mr. C. E. Lewis.

Mr. Gladstone then rose and expressed his regret that there was no sign in the debate of an agreement between the two sides. The attitude of the Ministerial benches to the proposal to give relief to some portion of the tenants was one of uncompromising hostility; and whether that attitude could be justified was the only question now to be settled. He commented on the fact that the amendment had neither been moved nor seconded by the representative of an Irish agricultural constituency. In the course of some general remarks on the Land Act of 1881, he repeated his belief that no general charge of misconduct could be alleged against the landlords, and he also expressed the opinion that the extirpation of the landlords or their removal from the country would be injurious to Irish interests. He was of opinion that a case had been made out for legislation in the direction of this Bill, believing that some tenants required relief of some kind. The issue of the Commission on rents contained both an assertion and a promise; and it furnished a sufficient ground for giving relief where it should be found necessary on judicial inquiry. No Government could issue such a commission unless they had reason to believe that there were tenants who could not pay their rents, and, proposing to inquire, they undertook to provide relief. His contention was that this relief ought not to be delayed until the end of the complicated process of inquiry and legislation contemplated by the Government, but ought to be given at once. Again, he asserted that the Government were committed to the position that some tenants in Ireland could not pay their rents; and, this being met with a cry of "No," he referred the dissentients to Lord Salisbury's language (Aug. 19), of which he gave a version which drew from the Chancellor of the Exchequer the retort, "He never said any such thing." Mr. Gladstone, however, repeated his statement, and, while reserving his freedom as to the details of the Bill, said he should give his support to the second reading of the Bill.

*Even by his own friends Mr. Gladstone's speech was*

scribed as a remarkable display of specious argument and special pleading, unsupported by any array of facts or authoritative statements. He objected to nearly every one of the details of Mr. Parnell's Bill, yet pledged himself to vote for its principles. On the following day (Sept. 21) the adjourned debate was resumed in a far weightier speech by Mr. J. Morley, who repeated Mr. Gladstone's regret that the Government had not displayed a greater spirit of conciliation, and expressed his agreement with Mr. Parnell both as to the fall of prices and the fixing of the rents without any allowance for this fall. He also agreed with Mr. Gladstone that by the appointment of the Commission the Government had admitted the existence of a genuine inability to pay rent. He supported the Bill because it afforded an easier and more expeditious method, through the Land Court, of making the inquiries which were contemplated by the Commission. The Land Court would, in fact, have been a better tribunal; and if the Government had accepted the principle that there were cases in which a *bonâ fide* inability to pay rents existed, the objections taken to the details of the Bill, as he showed, might easily have been removed. The Bill, among other advantages, would have removed from the landlords to the Court the odium of refusing reductions; it would have prevented collisions between the tenantry and the administrators of the law, and would have secured a calm in the autumn for the consideration of the Irish agrarian question.

As soon as Mr. Morley had finished, Mr. Parnell left the House, and no other Irish Nationalist except Mr. Dillon took part in the debate.

Lord Hartington, in stating the reasons why he found it impossible to arrive at the same conclusion as Mr. Gladstone with regard to the Bill, began by commenting on the absence from his speech, and from that of Mr. Morley, of any opinion as to the details of the Bill and the pleas on which it was founded. The Act of 1881 had not been a complete success. A strong case for inquiry had been made out, but he denied that there was any admission in the terms of the reference to the Commission, either that tenants were incapable of paying the judicial rents or of the necessity for suspending evictions. It was impossible to draw any positive conclusion from the eviction returns without further details as to whether they were for recent arrears or for rents long since due, and whether they were for other causes than the non-payment of rent. He particularly pointed out that the late Government had not proposed to suspend evictions, and he believed that when they were in office they were entirely opposed to any such legislation. He also ridiculed the doctrine that the Bill could be satisfactorily modified. The House ought not to accept it, mainly because it would have the effect of stopping altogether the payment of rent all over Ireland.

*Sir M. Hicks-Beach* denied that the Government had asserted

that the payment of rents was impossible, but what they desired to do was to ascertain why the rents were not paid. The real object of the Bill was to reduce the rent of Ireland by 50 per cent. all round; and, though a fall in prices was alleged as the cause, there was not a word of it in the Bill, and a tenant might get a reduction because of inability from other causes—for instance, because he had paid too much for his tenant-right. It would strike a deathblow to the Land Purchase Act, and would give the Irish tenant an unjust slice of his landlord's property. Next he touched on the methods pursued by the Commissioners in valuing farms, and mentioned various recent facts to show that prices are rising. As to evictions, he warned the House that the number of them afforded no reliable proof of inability to pay rent and had no connection with the particular Ministry in office. The returns were misleading, because they did not show what evictions took place for non-payment of rent, and how many of them were in the cases of judicial rents. The Government desired to see the land question settled on a firm basis, but they did not believe that this could be done by upsetting the settlement of 1881, as this Bill did. In conclusion, he said: "The right hon. member for Newcastle tells us that our position in regard to social order in Ireland is not a smooth one. He reminds us that we are under great disadvantages as compared with the Government of Lord Spencer. I know very well—nobody knows better—than the position of the Irish Government in this matter is not an easy one—that we are under great disadvantages; and I must state to the House that the position of affairs in Ireland now is such that it may well be that we shall have to ask the House to empower us to deal with the situation at an earlier date than may be anticipated. But we have no right to try to make our position in Ireland easy by the means which the right hon. gentleman suggests. He tells us that we make no attempt to secure peace and harmony with the Irish party. I would like to see peace and harmony with the Irish party, but I would not secure it for a moment at the price of doing that which I do not believe to be right. I am very well aware what the value of peace and harmony with the Irish party might be to the Government of Ireland, but we have no right to provide peace by doing injustice. The right hon. gentleman the member for Midlothian in 1881 characterised his own amendment of the Irish land law as one which had removed all injustice as between landlord and tenant. We take our stand upon that settlement until by inquiry it is proved to be wrong. We will not buy peace in Ireland by doing that which we are not convinced is right. We desire as much as any hon. members in this House can desire to govern Ireland constitutionally in accordance with the wishes of the Irish people. But we will not attempt to govern Ireland by a policy of blackmail. It is because that attempt has been made so often by right hon. gentlemen who sit on that bench" (pointing to

the front Opposition bench), "from time to time yielding to coercion and dictation on the part of hon. members below the gangway, in spite of what they knew was right, that we are landed to-day in the great difficulties that environ the Irish question, and that the hon. member for Cork has been emboldened to place before this House a Bill which, though purporting to be a mere instalment of justice to the poor Irish tenants, is an act of gross injustice and confiscation to the landlords of Ireland."

Sir William Harcourt, on behalf of the Liberal party, warmly repudiated the insinuation that they were ready to purchase peace for Ireland by paying blackmail. He showed from statistics that the fall in prices was almost universal, and denied that it had been foreseen or taken into account in fixing the judicial rents. After a violent appeal by Mr. Dillon against the evicting landlords, a division was taken and the Bill was rejected by 297 to 202. The majority (exclusive of tellers) was composed of 266 Conservatives and 31 Unionists; and the minority of 122 Liberals, 1 Unionist, and 81 Parnellites.

Before the House separated the Government was called upon to give some public intimation of its foreign policy, which the renewal of the French restlessness and suspicions in Egypt and the hidden revolution in Eastern Europe rendered almost obligatory. On the vote for the diplomatic services (Sept. 7), Sir George Campbell raised the former question by objecting to the continuance of our occupation of Egypt, and advocating the recall of Sir H. Drummond-Wolff. The Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Sir James Fergusson), in reply, argued that "it would be inexpedient, rash, and unpatriotic for the Government, for the sake of temporary applause from any part of the House, to say that our stay in Egypt was on the point of coming to an end. We ought not to pretend that we were going to leave until the reforms we had sought after, and some of which were already bearing fruit, had been fully accomplished." And he concluded by expressing the hope that Egypt "would gradually emerge from its condition of degradation and distress, and that, when our mission was accomplished, it would be universally acknowledged that our trusteeship of Egypt would redound to the credit of this country, and would be acknowledged to have been beneficial to Egypt." These views were emphasised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord R. Churchill) on the following day, when Sir George Campbell deprecated the proposed payment to the bondholders of the 5 per cent. reduction in their coupons which had been agreed to in the previous year. From the engagement to pay over any surplus on the year's receipts to recoup the bondholders, Lord R. Churchill declared, we were unable to escape. The only alternative which he could imagine would be the appointment of an International Commission, which he should regard as a greater evil to Egypt, *inasmuch as it might represent the bondholders' claims in a very aggressive way.* Whilst declining to enter into

any "elaborate review of this most melancholy story," Lord R. Churchill declared on behalf of his party: "We are not responsible for it in any way, and cannot be held responsible for it. I certainly cannot be held responsible directly or indirectly. I never ceased to protest against the whole thing from beginning to end; but being in Egypt, and having incurred enormous responsibilities in Egypt, we are perfectly determined to fulfil the responsibilities and obligations imposed upon us by the Convention. We are bound to do so by honour and duty alike, and we will not give up our work or withdraw from our responsibilities in Egypt until these obligations have been altogether faithfully fulfilled."

On the crisis in Eastern Europe the Ministry did not speak less clearly, and in spite of the very grave doubts which were openly expressed, even in the *Times* and the Conservative press as to the wisdom of our traditional pro-Turkish policy, in some quarters the expediency of a close understanding with Russia and Germany was warmly advocated. By others the advance of Russia through the Balkan provinces was argued to be a matter of secondary importance to British interests, and that what was established even at Constantinople Russia would be more vulnerable and more open to our attacks than within her present limits. Lord R. Churchill was urged by the advanced Radicals in the House (Sept. 22) to give a promise that the Government would not enter into any arrangement with foreign Powers without communicating it to Parliament. In reply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer pointed out that the logical effect of such a promise would be to convert Parliament into the Executive Government, which was not only unconstitutional but impracticable. But the Executive was the instrument of Parliament, and, if it acted in opposition to the wishes and opinions of Parliament, it could be displaced. As to the state of things in the Balkan peninsula, he said it was serious, and might become critical, but it was quite impossible for the Government to enter into a discussion of the circumstances without risk of injury to the public service. But if anything occurred to lead to the necessity of action, he undertook that the Government would act up to former precedents, and would call Parliament together. The policy of the Government on the Bulgarian question last year, he pointed out, had received the approval of the country, and its object was to maintain the concert of Europe to preserve the peace of Europe.

Three days later (Sept. 25) Parliament was prorogued for a commission, when the Queen's Speech, after describing our relations with foreign Powers to be friendly, alluded to foreign affairs in the following terms:—

"The mutiny of a portion of the Bulgarian army has led to the abdication of Prince Alexander. A Regency has been established, which is now administering the affairs of the Principality, and preparations are being made for the election of a new Prince."



successor, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty of Berlin.

"In answer to a communication addressed by the Porte to the signatory Powers, parties to that treaty, I have stated that, so far as this country is concerned, there will be no infraction of the conditions guaranteed by treaties to Bulgaria. Assurances to the same effect have been given by other Powers.

"The demarcation of the Afghan frontier has advanced to within a few miles of the Oxus. In view of the approach of winter, my Commission has been withdrawn; but the information which they have obtained will be sufficient for the determination, by direct negotiation between the two Courts, of the portion of frontier which still remains unmarked."

The growth of the Federal idea which had been fostered by the personal interchange of views among Colonial statesmen present in this country was also referred to in the Queen's Speech, with a promise that some steps should be taken to give it a practical shape:—

"I have observed with much satisfaction the interest which in an increasing degree is evinced by the people of this country in the welfare of their Colonial and Indian fellow-subjects; and I am led to the conviction that there is on all sides a growing desire to draw closer in every practicable way the bonds which unite the various portions of the Empire. I have authorised communications to be entered into with the principal Colonial Governments with a view to the fuller consideration of matters of common interest."

The short session had been so tame and uneventful that Lord R. Churchill's speech at Dartford (Oct. 2), in the first week of the recess, invited early and eager discussion of the Ministerial programme. Commencing with a eulogy of the loyalty with which the Unionist Liberals had supported the Conservative Ministry, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not long in showing how, in his opinion, the debt of gratitude thus incurred might be best discharged. Subject to the necessity of maintaining union with the Unionists, the policy of the Government in Ireland would be to carry out the law, whatever the danger, personal or political; to substitute single for dual ownership, and to grant local self-government. Turning to home affairs, Lord R. Churchill declared that, whilst Mr. Gladstone legislated by intuition, "the Conservatives, or rather the Unionist party," were determined to legislate only upon ascertained facts. He then, with somewhat strange forgetfulness of his own attitude on a previous occasion, argued the necessity of "the closure" by a bare majority, without which the Government of the day would be at any time at the mercy of its opponents. He then declared that the Government would be prepared to introduce into Parliament *a Bill which should provide facilities, through the operation of local authorities, for the acquisition by the agricultural*

labourer of freehold plots and allotments of land. He further held out the promise of an alteration in the law of tithe, so that payment should in the first instance be demanded of the landlord; and a threat to remodel railway rates, so that the home producer should not be underbid by the foreigner. He hinted, with more or less calmness, at a system of legislation by which landed property might be transferred cheaply and quickly; at a broad reorganisation of local government, with a new assessment and application of local taxation; and, finally, at some comprehensive scheme for reducing the national expenditure. Turning, lastly, to foreign politics, Lord R. Churchill, after alluding to "the brutal and cowardly conspiracy" which resulted in overthrowing Prince Alexander and "dashing" Lord Salisbury's hopes, laid down the lines of the new foreign policy as follows: "It has been said by some, and even by persons of authority and influence, that in the issues which are involved England has no close or material interest. Such an assertion would appear to me to be far too loose and general. The sympathy of England with liberty and with the freedom and independence of communities and nationalities is of ancient origin, and has become the traditional direction of our foreign policy. The policy based on this strong sympathy is not so purely sentimental as a careless critic might suppose. To England Europe owes much of her modern popular freedom. In our own time our nation has done much, either by direct intervention or by energetic moral support, to establish upon firm foundations the freedom of Italy and Greece. The policy of Lord Beaconsfield in 1878, so much misrepresented, so much misunderstood, had this for its most conspicuous characteristic, that it rescued the young liberties of the peoples in the Balkan peninsula, who, having been saved from the frying-pan of Turkish misrule, were in danger of falling into the fire of Russian autocracy. Times and circumstances alter, and the particular policy which may be suitable for one set of circumstances may require to be modified as those circumstances change." Referring to Count Kálmoky's declaration two days previously that "the freedom and independence of the Danubian provinces and of the Balkan nationalities are a primary and vital object in the policy of the Austro-Hungarian Empire," Lord R. Churchill declared that he could honourably and safely entrust to that Power the foremost part in this international duty. He concluded: "As Lord Salisbury said at Manchester in 1878, 'the Austrian sentinel is on the ramparts,' and we cannot doubt that the liberty-giving policy of the Treaty of Berlin will be carefully and watchfully protected. Whatever modification this great fact may enable us to make in our foreign policy, whatever diminution of isolated risk and sole responsibility this may enable us to effect, you may be certain of one thing—that there will be no sudden or violent departure *by her Majesty's* present Government from the main principles

of foreign policy which I have before alluded to, and which for nearly three centuries mark in strong, distinct, and clear lines the course of the British Empire among the nations of the world." This speech, whilst cordially accepted by the Conservatives and Unionist organs as "reasonable, temperate, and practical," caused no small irritation among the Radicals, by whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer was accused of being an unscrupulous time-server, who had stolen the Liberal programme. Some few critics, however, whose partisanship was less keen, were willing to accept Liberal measures from whatever source they might come, provided only their groundwork was real, not sham Liberalism. On the Conservative side a few grumblings were heard as to the effacement of Lord Salisbury behind his lieutenant; and fears were expressed lest the Ministry should find itself unexpectedly pledged to a programme which the party would not endure. On one point Lord R. Churchill's speech called forth from Mr. Chaplin an energetic protest—on the question of closure by a bare majority. The Conservatives had a few years before made so strong a stand for the rights of the minority, that so complete a *volte-face* would, if hastily adopted, more than anything give force to the reproach that they had abandoned their former convictions, and had no guide but expediency. Lord R. Churchill's temporary absence from England gave full opportunity for the discussion of these views among the leaders of the party; but if any idea of repudiating was mooted, it was not acted upon. On his side, the Chancellor of the Exchequer's three weeks' holiday in Germany seemed only to have impressed upon him the need of such a programme as he had sketched out at Dartford. His first act on his return was to attend the conference of the National Conservative Union (Oct. 26) at Bradford, when he made three important speeches. In the first, he insisted that the alliance with the Liberal Unionists was still as important as ever, and that the Tories ought to work with them not less cordially, or even more cordially, at the next election than they did at the last. "So long as we continue to receive from the Liberal Unionists that independent, but still at the same time very loyal support, which they gave us in the last session of Parliament, so long, I submit to you, they have a right to the same support, and even to more support than that which they obtained from us in the last election."

Lord Randolph Churchill reiterated the views of foreign policy which he had expressed at Dartford, although he admitted that our policy should be adapted, as it would have been by Lord Beaconsfield, to the changes in relation of foreign Powers towards each other. "Europe at the present moment," he said, "is in a state of transition, nor would it appear that the interests of this country are for a moment critically menaced. It is quite possible that the most prudent and statesmanlike course for us to adopt

at the present moment is to watch very carefully and closely the state of things which are now taking place in Europe, and abstain from committing ourselves to any positive line." In domestic policy he welcomed Mr. Jesse Collings as an ally, and was willing to approach his proposal for improving the condition of agricultural labourers, although he could not pledge himself to that peculiar method of dealing with the land tenure under the title of "three acres and a cow." On the subject of the closure, which he described as the "motor muscle" of any scheme of reform of Parliamentary procedure, he frankly explained his change of opinion, and declared that, without the power of closing a debate according to the will of the majority, all Parliamentary institutions would be weakened, impaired, and ultimately destroyed. He defended himself at some length against the charge of having changed his views so completely on this point, but circumstances, he urged, had changed even more completely than his opinions since the time when Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister, and he only leader of the "Fourth Party." In his remarks about Ireland, he dwelt with satisfaction on the more cheering symptoms of that country. The harvest had been good, and well gathered in. There were no serious signs of the potato famine with which Mr. Parnell had threatened them. Rents were, on the whole, being well paid. The landlords were behaving very well in their remissions of rent. Though the Government had given a most solemn promise to Parliament to summon it in the autumn if they wanted its aid in keeping order in Ireland, and though nothing would induce them to break it, there was at present no reason to fear that this would be necessary. The condition of their political opponents was a condition of sickness. Referring to the address of a deputation from Dublin, he said: "The Irish people were for the moment influenced by agitation, and unfortunately they were influenced by men who had occupied high offices under the Crown, and who now used their reputation to weaken the authority of the Crown. For these reasons the constitutional principles were for a moment at a discount in Ireland, but they might be confident that the voice that England had sounded so fairly with regard to the future of Ireland and Great Britain will penetrate to the remotest corners of Ireland, and would make itself heard even in the hamlets and huts of Connemara. All that they wanted was that constitutional principles and powers, as they were popular in England, should be made popular in Ireland, and that Ireland should benefit by what England had benefited—a just, strong, and orderly government; that the government of Ireland which meant the fortunes of the Irish people, should no longer be the battle-ground of political parties, and that if, at any rate they could not combine all parties, at least most of the political parties should combine to give Ireland that which England has for so many years enjoyed."

Mr. Chaplin took the occasion of this great gathering of Conservatives to renew his protest against closure by a bare majority, declaring that he had not changed the opinions which he had always held in connection with the Tory party as a whole on that subject. Certainly nothing had occurred to warrant a change against which three members of the Cabinet had voted only three months previously.

On behalf of the ex-Ministers, the speeches were neither numerous nor particularly noteworthy. Mr. Gladstone was visited (Oct. 4) at Hawarden by five deputations, one presenting an address from 400,000 women of Ireland, and the other four urging the freedoms of Cork, Limerick, Waterford, and Clonmel. In accepting the honours conferred upon him, Mr. Gladstone spoke in terms of warm appreciation of the temperance with which the Home Rule agitation was being carried on, repeating his conviction that it would succeed, and praised Irish "moderation" in not demanding Repeal. He denied that Ireland wished separation, quoting various Irish leaders, and especially Connell, who had desired to see the countries united by "the olden link of the Crown." He stated that he only remained in order to carry Home Rule, and would retire instantly if by so doing he could aid its passing. He considered the history of the Union disgraceful, and pointed out that, while the civil government of England cost 8s. a head, that of Ireland cost 16s. He accused the Dissident Liberals of destroying the power of the Liberal party, as they had raised the Tory numbers from 250 to 315, and were, in fact, "thorough-going supporters of the Tories."

Lord Rosebery, on the eve of his departure for India, stopped on his way south at Newcastle (Oct. 19) to speak a few words of encouragement to the Liberal Club of that town. Admitting that the three most important subjects of the moment were Ireland, the Currency, and the Eastern Question, he passed aside from them and devoted his speech solely to home politics. He wanted the Unionists, he said, to come back to the Liberal fold. They were only 73, while the Liberals were 196; and they therefore should make all the concessions. If, however, the Unionists would accept Mr. Gladstone as leader, and the general lines of his policy towards Ireland, then, for the sake of "auld lang syne," all should be forgotten and forgiven. If they refused this offer, then the Unionists would all be thrown out at the next elections. The Liberals could not "rise so high or sink so low" as to vote for them, and the Tories were already moaning over the thirty-seven seats lost to them through their complaisance to Unionists. He then proceeded to analyse the figures of the election at some length. He calculated that the Liberal party had fallen from 354 in 1880 to 196 in 1886, and this notwithstanding the additional seats created in the interval. The total Liberal vote given for Mr. Gladstone in



1885 had been 2,157,000, but six months later it had fallen to 1,242,000 on a register of nearly five-and-three-quarter millions of electors. From this he argued that the Liberal defeat was due to abstention, and not to any marked hostility to Mr. Gladstone's plan. Mr. Bright, who about the same time was asked to be present at a meeting called in honour of Mr. Schnadhorst, took a less hopeful view of the present and the future state of the Liberal party. "I should," he wrote in reply, "I doubt not, be expected to speak without reference to the unhappy circumstances which have caused the removal of Mr. Schnadhorst from Birmingham to London, and without dwelling upon the unfortunate schism in the Liberal party. I do not wish to attack my former friends and to cast blame where I think grievous error has been committed. I can only hope the present clouds may be dispelled, and that our former harmony may be restored. To promote this, I think silence for the time is better than speaking, and I therefore prefer to be absent from any public meeting where criticism might be expected from me." This attitude, which was indorsed by others among the Unionists, only served to stimulate the ardour of the Gladstonian Liberals.

At the gathering of the Scottish Liberal Association held at Glasgow (Oct. 30), under the presidency of Lord Elgin, the feelings of the northern Liberals were plainly shown. In the face of an appeal from the president, deprecating any aggressive action against the Liberal Unionists, Mr. Brown, who had displaced Sir G. O. Trevelyan as member for the Border Burghs, moved a resolution of hearty sympathy with Mr. Gladstone "in his desire to secure to Ireland a plan of Home Rule which will satisfy the just aspirations of the Irish people, and will promote true unity and consolidation of the Empire."

Mr. Marjoribanks, who had at one time acted as Liberal whip, proposed a conciliatory amendment, which was rejected by an enormous majority, only nine voting in its favour, and "Home Rule for Ireland" was adopted as the touchstone of Scottish Liberalism. This feeling, though in a somewhat modified form, was found to animate their English colleagues.

At the great Conference of the National Liberal Federation held at Leeds (Nov. 3), the president, Sir James Kitson, announced that one hundred Liberal associations had joined the federation since Mr. Chamberlain's secession, and that the total number affiliated was 30 per cent. higher. The federation, after passing a vote of unabated confidence in Mr. Gladstone as their leader, in a way which was something more than a formal ovation, decided upon a programme of which the following were the principal points: 1, approval of a separate Irish legislature for Irish affairs; 2, reform of the land laws; 3, a popular system of county government; 4, local option as regards spirit licences; 5, equality between the State and all

arms of religious belief ; 6, free schools ; 7, reform of parliamentary procedure ; 8, reform of the registration of electors ; 9, non-intervention in European affairs so as to prepare the way for a reduction of the Army and Navy Estimates. No reference was made either by the speakers or in the programme to the question of Disestablishment, even in Wales, although on the eve of the meeting of the conference Mr. Stuart Rendel, M.P., had written to Mr. John Morley, as president, to urge this question on the attention of the delegates. In supporting this programme of the federation, Mr. Morley insisted that it was impossible, and would be dishonourable to go back from Home Rule. He would leave the Unionist Liberals alone to meditate on their position. He would argue the question with perfect tolerance, for he admitted its difficulty, and he would anathematise no one ; but on Home Rule in some shape satisfactory to Ireland he would positively insist. Mr. Gladstone last session had carried concession up to, if not even beyond, what he himself should have thought the limit of wisdom. The same line was taken by Mr. Fowler, who, however, went further when he appealed to all Unionists who were anxious only for the supremacy of the Parliament and the integrity of the kingdom to join them on the ground that they too (the Gladstonians) were as anxious as anybody to enforce that supremacy and to secure that integrity.

At the evening meeting Mr. Morley spoke at greater length, urging the delegates to adopt a resolution which should pledge the Liberal party to carry on the efforts begun by Mr. Gladstone to effect a durable settlement of the Irish Question. He maintained that such a settlement to be durable must meet the wishes and the voice of the Irish electors as expressed by their representatives in the House of Commons, and he gave expression to a third article—namely, that the only settlement that would comply with this condition was the creation of a legislative body for managing such affairs as Parliament should determine to be distinctively, peculiarly, and exclusively Irish affairs.

Turning to more general questions, Mr. Morley expressed his fear that the day of degraded politics might have dawned—"a state of things in which generous controversy about policy and about principles was about to give place to cabals, intrigues, and quarrels about men." He drew a parallel between the actual position of Mr. Gladstone and that of Sir Robert Walpole at the moment when the Whigs and Tories, who agreed in nothing else, united in a motion brought forward in the House of Commons, "that an humble address be presented to his Majesty that he would be graciously pleased to remove the Right Hon. Sir Robert Walpole from his Majesty's presence and councils for ever." Mr. Morley then touched upon the rival Tory programme, expressing a hearty disbelief and complete con-

“for those things of threads and patches, those rickety puppets which are dangled in the name of Conservative principles.” If the Government brought in good bills, it would be the duty of Liberals to support them, no matter who led the orchestra; but Liberals were not going to turn Tories because they pretended to have turned Radicals. Adverting to the moral of Lord R. Churchill’s speech at Bradford, “that statesmen must change their minds according to circumstances,” Mr. Morley said that if such evolutions were politics, “I declare quite sincerely and simply that I would rather be a highwayman than a politician. A highwayman has more exercise; he has more open air; he keeps better hours, and is treated quite as respectably. If they propose real reforms of course we shall accept them; but, depend upon it, the gushing spring of Tory reform will not be very long before it runs dry. You will not get a bounteous affluence of fresh water into the Tory pump by the simple act of fitting it with a brand-new Radical handle, kindly lent for the occasion by a friend from Birmingham.” In conclusion, Mr. Morley commented at some length on Lord R. Churchill’s remark that the Government would be in no hurry to give local government to Ireland, and insisted that if an improvement in the condition of Irish counties was to be used as the excuse for not giving Ireland even the same local liberties as England, the Irish would very quickly draw the inference that the Parliament at Westminster was perfectly unserviceable for the purpose of removing Irish grievances.

The other prominent speaker was Sir W. Harcourt, who devoted himself chiefly to showing that Lord R. Churchill had abandoned all his principles without the least compunction. He now boasted that he had more than once proved right in his estimate of political affairs. And no doubt, said Sir W. Harcourt, that was perfectly true, and true for the same reason for which it is true that if a man calls *both* heads and tails in playing at pitch-and-toss, he is pretty sure to be right in one of his guesses. The Tories, without the Liberal Unionists, were like an empty sack—they could not stand upright. He denounced with well-simulated indignation the bond between the Tories and the Unionists, which he described as being a bond that the Unionists would support the Tory Government whatever they do, and that the Tory Government are always to do what the Unionists bid.

The affairs of Ireland, which are more particularly discussed in the following chapter, were meanwhile engaging the attention of the Government. The appointment of Sir Redvers Buller to a quasi-command in the south-west of Ireland had been received with general approval in this country, and the combined firmness and discretion which he displayed in the execution of this thankless task justified the selection of the Ministry. Whilst proving by the energy he infused into his subordinates the

"Moonlighters" would no longer escape with impunity, he impressed upon landlords the need of forbearance towards their impoverished tenantry. Unfortunately the agitators, finding their influence seriously threatened, wished to turn to their own advantage the concessions of the landlords, and attempted to persuade the tenants that if they still refused to pay even the reduced rents the Executive would not interfere to compel them. The removal of Sir Robert Hamilton from the Under-Secretaryship of Ireland followed after a short interval, and it was at once seized upon by the Nationalist press in Ireland and by the anti-Ministerialists in England as evidence that the Ministry viewed with displeasure the exercise of "dispensing powers," and that Sir R. Hamilton was too much imbued with the views which Lord Spencer and Mr. Morley were openly advocating. There was of course no foundation for any such charge, but it is possible that Sir M. Hicks-Beach might have thought that the influence of the courts and of the police was weakened by the presence at Dublin Castle of one whose sympathies were supposed to lie with his predecessor's policy.

Under these circumstances Lord Salisbury's speech at the Guildhall banquet (Nov. 9) was looked for with much expectation, heightened in some degree by the circumstances which for a moment had threatened to mark Lord Mayor's Day by rioting and disorder. The Socialists, who since the acquittal of their leaders in the spring had remained comparatively inoffensive, organised a procession of the unemployed, who were to follow the Lord Mayor in his progress from the City to the West End. The dangers of a collision between the crowd and the Socialists, or of a possible repetition of the scenes of the preceding February, were at once perceived, and, after some correspondence between the police authorities and the Socialist leaders, the latter were informed that the proposed "demonstration" would not be permitted. Elaborate precautions were taken to prevent this order from being evaded, and Trafalgar Square, which was subsequently selected as the gathering place of the Socialists, was strongly occupied by the police from early morning, whilst the military were kept in readiness in case of any serious breach of the peace. The precautions were completely satisfactory, for although a small meeting was held in spite of the police in Trafalgar Square, the outlets were too closely guarded, and the crowds were broken up whenever they attempted to gather in large numbers. At a later date, however (Nov. 21), the Social Democratic Federation was able to hold a meeting in Trafalgar Square, which, although carefully watched by the police, passed off without any disturbance of the peace. The speakers at the various platforms were able to make themselves heard to only those in their immediate neighbourhood; but the resolutions, *which were in favour of the State regulation of labour and the more equal distribution of property*, were passed amid low

cheers. As the day selected, moreover, was a Sunday, there was no interruption of business by the crowd or any damage done to private property.

At the Guildhall Lord Salisbury was consequently able to claim the attention of his audience for Irish and foreign affairs. With regard to the former, he defined the programme of the Government. "Our business is to carry into effect that mandate in favour of the integrity of the Empire which we received from the constituencies last summer, and afterwards, subject to that great and paramount consideration, to enforce the law which has been too long neglected, to uphold the rights which have been too long trodden under foot, and by so doing to restore that prosperity which can be based upon no other foundation than respect for the law and the maintenance of rights." He thought that the relations of landlords and tenants had been improved. General Buller had already repudiated the notion that the Government claimed any dispensing power in relation to the enforcement of the law; but they had in private exhorted all to exercise their legal rights with due consideration for their fellow-citizens. "It is not to legislation, but to a steady course of honest government, if we can obtain it, that I look for the restoration of prosperity in that country. I do not exclude legislation; it may be necessary, but I should recommend as little of it as possible, and that that which we have of it should be undertaken with as little haste and with as much caution and prudence as we can command. The salvation of Ireland for the time is to be found more in good government than in an alteration of the law; and the sooner we can dissuade her population from speculating in politics, the more rapidly they will take to more wholesome modes of thought." Passing on to the consideration of foreign affairs, Lord Salisbury, whilst expressing not only the feelings of his audience, but the general opinion of all moderate politicians, managed to offend the susceptibilities of both French and Russian journalists. "Our stay in Egypt," he said, "was limited in duration; but the limit is not a limit of time—it is a limit of the work we have to do. . . . That work is progressing, but we cannot leave the country until it is secure from foreign aggression, and until we have a sufficient foundation for hoping that it will be free from anarchy." Then passing on to Bulgaria, and commenting upon the events of which it was the scene, Lord Salisbury, without naming Russia, utterly condemned Russian action. The officers who mutinied were "debauched by foreign gold," and Europe was thrown into consternation to hear that the resources of diplomacy had been exhausted "to save them from the doom they had so justly merited." "Encroachment after encroachment upon the rights of a free and independent people" had followed, "fortunately hitherto limited within the bounds of diplomatic menace." The people of Bulgaria had, however, behaved well, and might yet have



illiant history. As to this country, it had an interest in maintaining the Treaty of Berlin, "but not an isolated interest." It would do its part if "the Powers of Europe, or any considerable portion of them," did theirs. England never had acted in defending Turkey without allies, even the Duke of Wellington, "not an unwarlike person," standing neutral when she was left alone; while Lord Aberdeen, though a fanatic for peace, fought because she had allies. The first interest in the Balkans was that of Austria, and "the policy which Austria pursues will contribute very largely to shape the policy which England will pursue." If England were directly assailed in her interest or her honour, England would act at once and alone; but the duty of defending Bulgaria fell to her only as one power in Europe. The Premier concluded with an eloquent expression of his belief that peace would be maintained, and that the infant liberties of Bulgaria would not be destroyed. This declaration of English policy was received with very mixed feelings by the Continental press. The Hungarian newspapers were the most exuberant in their expression of approval, but those of Austria thought Lord Salisbury's pledges not sufficiently definite; Italy warmly echoed the sentiments of the speech; and the German semi-official as well as Liberal organs, although more cautious and restrained, signified their approbation. The Russian journals taunted Austria with allowing herself to be made the cat's-paw of Great Britain, but otherwise abstained from comment, leaving to the French press the distinction of being thoroughly hostile. According to its view, Russia's conduct in Bulgaria was justified by England's in Egypt, and it expressed a scarcely veiled hope that in Asia, if not in Eastern Europe, Russia and England would find fresh subjects of disagreement and discord. A curious commentary on the speech, however, appeared in the *Irish Nation*, which, on the presumed authority of a Catholic ecclesiastic in Vienna, affirmed that a treaty existed, binding Germany, Austria, England, and Italy to resist Russia in the event of her entering the Balkans. According to this document, Austria would attack Russia by land, whilst the British and Italian fleets, admitted to the Black Sea, would operate on the coast. In the event of Turkey's non-compliance, the Dardanelles would be forced, and her European provinces divided among the Balkan States. Meanwhile Germany would stand aloof, so long as France remained quiet and Austria held her own; in the latter case she would attack Russia, and in the former would join Italy in invading France.

But in spite of the many dramatic incidents which the Bulgarian revolution evoked, they failed to occupy any large share of attention in this country. The Irish Question and the anomalous condition of parties it had developed alone excited interest. Even *Mr. Labouchere's speech at Manchester* (Nov. 24), in which he developed the programme of the extreme Radicals, aroused but

a languid or fleeting criticism. After expressing himself convinced that nothing short of Home Rule would give contentment to Ireland and restore peace to England, Mr. Labouchere declared himself in favour of free education, retrenchment, and non-intervention in Continental politics. He advocated Disestablishment and Disendowment of the State Church, the reduction of ministerial salaries, and the abolition of grants to members of the royal family. He expressed himself in favour of the abolition of all indirect taxation, and proposed to raise all revenue from direct taxes, to abolish the House of Lords, and adopt triennial parliaments. All these points, however, he admitted, were subordinate to the settlement of the Irish Question. The Liberal conference at Leicester (Nov. 25) occupied itself similarly in the discussion of this single question. Lord Spencer, who was the principal speaker, regretted the removal of Sir Robert Hamilton at so critical a moment; but he scarcely ventured to censure the Government for their decision. He declared Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy "both necessary and right," and then he proceeded to prove this by saying that as we had been trying every other remedy but Home Rule, and had failed, we ought now to try Home Rule.

He was followed by Mr. H. Fowler, who was even more despondent. He admitted that the Liberals were in a fog, and would only urge them to hold together until the fog should lift by natural causes or be dispersed by some active agency. He admitted the danger of separation, which loomed as an alternative, but declared that it should never take place except by force.

Although the position of the Gladstonian Liberals had scarcely, if at all, improved during the autumn months, the Conservatives were showing symptoms of disintegration. Mr. Chaplin was not alone in his repugnance to the proposal for closing debate by a bare majority of the House, and some other projects foreshadowed by Lord R. Churchill had occasioned wavering in the Tory ranks. His proposals for rigid retrenchment of public expenditure, and still more his refusal to assist the Metropolitan Board of Works in obtaining a continuance of the coal and wine duties, raised a storm of hostile criticism, and made the ratepayers of London tremble at the prospect of increased demands. The Postmaster-General (Mr. Raikes), pursuing a similar policy, terminated the contracts for the Atlantic mail service with the Cunard and White Star lines, and, offering them to the lowest bidders, aroused ill-will amongst the shipping interests of Liverpool and Cork.

The Liberal Unionists were, moreover, forced to realise their anomalous position on the occasion of a vacancy which occurred at Brighton. By common consent, it was felt important to provide Mr. Goschen with a seat, and his name was proposed to the Brighton electors. Mr. Goschen, however, declined to offer him-

self except as a Liberal, and proposed to retain his seat on the Liberal side of the House. The Tories insisted that if he were to represent them, it should be only as a Ministerialist, and the Liberal Unionists being unable to carry the seat unaided, Mr. Goschen declined the nomination. Both sections of the Liberals then proposed to invite and offer the seat to Sir Geo. Trevelyan; but he also declined to represent a party which was so absolutely divided on the most important question of the hour.

A fresh impulse was momentarily given to the discussion of Irish affairs by Mr. Morley's northern campaign. In his first speech, delivered at Hawick (Nov. 29), he passed over in silence Mr. Dillon's "Plan of Campaign," which at that moment had been adopted to checkmate the landlords who appealed for Government support; but he referred in gloomy terms to the serious outlook in Ireland, and to the fulfilment of his own forebodings. He assailed the Government for not having accepted in September the proposal which he himself had founded on Mr. Parnell's amendment to the Address, to devolve on the Land Court the power of staying ejectments in cases where three-fourths of the rent had been paid, and where the Court was convinced that the fall in the price of produce had caused the inability to pay the remainder. Had the Government accepted that amendment, he argued, there would have been a definite law to enforce. Now they had been obliged to bring moral pressure to bear on the landlords to waive their legal rights; and thus, instead of firmly administering a good law, they were interfering with the administration of a bad law. He then went on to expose Lord Randolph Churchill's inconsistency in first promising "simultaneous" reforms in local government for England, Scotland, and Ireland, and then declaring that, as regards Ireland, the measure promised ought not to be hurried on, but to be very carefully considered; and for reproaching the House of Commons for wasting so much time over the Irish estimates for local works, on the ground that it was the firm determination of the Government to place the control of those local works in the hands of the Irish people, and then allowing his chief to declare, on behalf of the Government, at the Guildhall, that what Ireland wanted was not new legislation, but a firm administration of the existing law.

Three days later (Dec. 2) Mr. Morley spoke at Edinburgh. He said that he had no objection at all to Lord Randolph Churchill's political *menu*, but that all the same he should refuse to say grace till the dish-covers were removed, and he went on to describe the Government as resembling a blind man led by two very lively dogs with very different conceptions of the route. He apologised for his comparative ignorance of purely Scottish affairs, but said that, whatever the desire for extended local government in Scotland *might be*, he was quite sure that all Scotch Liberals would *agree in this*—that the need for extended local government

Scotland was not at all on all-fours with the need for Home Rule in Ireland. It did not follow in the least that, because Ireland needed a local Legislature and an Executive dependent on it, Scotland needed one too, and against that view he was most anxious to protest. After indicating his sympathy with the cause of Disestablishment in Scotland, Mr. Morley excused himself for saying nothing on the new programme of the National League in Ireland—the “Plan of Campaign”—on the ground that the question would soon come before Irish judges, and that Englishmen should not interfere. In the latter part of his speech Mr. Morley argued at some length for the position that to give Ireland a separate Legislature, and yet not to give her a separate Executive, dependent on that Legislature, would be to mock her with the hope of reforms which need never be carried out. He was very eloquent in his promises that Ireland would be politically transformed by Home Rule, and that instead of sending the new Legislature the sort of patriot to whom we had recently been accustomed, she would turn over a new leaf, and send to the men of whom she might be really proud.

But in spite of these assurances, the public mind was not comforted. The “Plan of Campaign,” which the Gladstonian Liberals so carefully avoided, did not seem to such as were not professional politicians that blessed “oblivion of the past” which Mr. Gladstone had promised on behalf of the Irish Home Rule. A warning, delivered by Mr. Dillon at Castlereagh (Dec. 1), seemed to hold out the prospect of a summary “day of reckoning,” when the Irish should be allowed to settle their own affairs. Lord Kilcoursie, who had been elected for South Somersetshire as a Home Ruler and a follower of Mr. Gladstone, found himself constrained to state publicly in a letter to the *Daily News* (Dec. 1) that if Mr. Dillon’s speech was to be understood “as the settled and deliberate opinions of the Irish party, as well as an exposition of its future policy,” he could not again vote for Home Rule.

It was therefore not surprising that under such circumstances the Unionist Liberals should meet in a particularly happy and jubilant spirit. They, at least outwardly, were animated by a common object: they were practically masters of the situation, and their influence was the stronger, since their leaders were indifferent to the temptations of office. On more than one occasion they had stood aside when important posts were placed at their disposal; and their followers, animated by a like spirit, had abstained from urging their claims to tangible rewards.

A meeting of their body, held at Willis’s Rooms (Dec. 7), was attended by its most prominent members. Mr. Bright, one of the few who absented themselves, wrote with obvious reference to the silence of the Liberal leaders on what was passing in Ireland. “If I were forced to speak I should have to say so many strong things, and I fear much I might not be of any real service. I could say nothing without seeming to attack Mr. Gladstone.”

This I might even do if I were sure of doing good ; but I am not sure of this, and I abstain from attacking him from my personal regard for him, which even his present unwisdom cannot greatly diminish."

Mr. Chamberlain, who was still travelling abroad, telegraphed that if Mr. Gladstone's or any equally objectionable Home Rule scheme were not introduced the two sections of the Liberal party might confer freely together on the concessions to be made to Ireland—an assurance which was not indorsed with any great warmth by the meeting. Lord Hartington's presidential address, however, was in full accord with the prevailing sentiment, and its reception showed how cordially the Unionists were agreed upon the Irish Question. Lord Hartington began by insisting on the party's alliance with the Conservatives for the one object of maintaining the Legislative Union, as the very key of the situation. That alliance could not be given up. As for Mr. Gladstone's proposal that the Liberal Unionists should join him in spurring on the Government to bring forward their Irish policy, he could not accept it, because he did not wish the Government to produce a Home Rule policy of their own, or any substitute for it, and he was very glad that they were really pledged not to produce one. The fall of the present Government would mean the victory of a Home Rule Government, and that was precisely the calamity that the Unionists desired to ward off. There was, however, no reason at all at present to fear that it would strain the Liberalism of the Liberals to support the present Government. The Ministry seemed to desire a very sufficient measure of reform, and he believed that the alliance with the Unionist Liberals was doing a great deal to Liberalise the Conservative Government. He and his friends had always anticipated that they might have to face "outrage, disorder, assassination, dynamite" before the struggle was over, and already the National League was doing its best to introduce anarchy in Ireland ; but he saw nothing in their menaces to move him a hair's-breadth from his political position. Finally, Lord Hartington challenged Mr. Gladstone, in a very impressive passage, to condemn the present policy of Mr. Dillon and Mr. O'Brien, and held that if such a condemnation was delayed the credit of the Liberal party would suffer very seriously, and for that credit he and his friends felt as keenly as any Liberal Home Ruler.

Lord Selborne followed up this appeal to Mr. Gladstone with a special appeal to Lord Spencer, who had said that we could not tolerate anarchy in Ireland, and recommending to all Liberals Professor Dicey's powerful book on "England's Case against Home Rule." Lord Selborne also expressed his wonder that Mr. Gladstone, while treating his Home Rule scheme as final for Ireland, had stirred up Scotland and Wales to complicate the question by demanding Home Rule for themselves. Mr. George Dixon delivered, as a Birmingham Radical, a most hear-



speech in support of Lord Hartington, and promised the utmost patience to the Government rather than that the Unionists should replace a Home Rule party in power. He deeply regretted, however, the long apathy to the wrongs of Ireland which preceded Mr. Gladstone's accession to power in 1868. Mr. T. W. Russell M.P. for South Tyrone, made an excellent speech, in which he drew the natural inference from Archbishop Walsh's adhesion to the policy of the National League's new campaign; Mrs. Fawcett declared her husband's firm conviction that the Union went to the very heart and root of our existence as a nation; while the Duke of Westminster and Lord Northbrook both gave their cordial support to Lord Hartington's policy.

The afternoon conference was followed by an evening banquet, at which Lord Hartington took the chair; and the principal speech of the evening, "The Unionist Cause," was made by Mr. Goschen. In a brilliant summary of the situation he argued that though not in office their leader was "practically in power" and that the Liberal Unionists, who began by combining to maintain the Union, had now devolved upon them the responsibility of maintaining "the integrity of society" and the "structure of the social fabric," by defending the Liberal cause against the cause of anarchy. He ridiculed the overtures made to them to join the "Gladstone-Parnell-Labouchere-Dillon-O'Brien party" as preposterous. Had Mr. Gladstone's measure been passed whether without or with the Land Bill, Ireland, with the reduced prices of Irish products, would at that moment have been financially bankrupt, and the financial crash which the Unionists predicted within two or three years would have come in the very first year. It was on the Liberal Unionists that the duty of vindicating the old reputation of English Liberalism for a wise and sagacious moderation depended.

Mr. Goschen was followed by Lord Derby, who expressed his surprise at the "tolerance, not to call it encouragement, which the Irish, against law and property," were receiving from respectable English politicians; and he asked them whether the example might not be contagious, and whether the undisguised Socialism being preached in Ireland might not at some no distant day be practised in this country. Sir Henry James declared that the Unionist Liberals were for the present, in commercial phrase, "carried to a suspense account," but that it must depend on the manner in which the other section of the Liberals should be led in which of the two great parties the Unionist Liberals would ultimately be absorbed. Sir George Trevelyan declared that it was his only crime that he could not consent to withdraw from quelling and law-abiding citizens the shield of the central and Imperial Government, or to place the appointment of judges, the command of the police, the protection of juries, the security of life, limb, purse, and house-roof, at the disposal of those who were giving ovations to men whose only claim to public gratitude

that they had been committed for moonlighting or were urging farmers to withhold money from its legal owners. This, he declared, was not politics, but mere lawlessness, and it was idle to expect that the majority of Englishmen would ever consent that the projection of the "Plan of Campaign" should be the guardian of public safety in Ireland.

The complete harmony which reigned at the Unionist meeting justified Lord Salisbury, when addressing the City Conservatives on the following day (Dec. 8), in saying that resistance on behalf of the fundamental principles of the Constitution "is not that hopeless matter which some would like to induce you to imagine." He insisted, however, that the Conservatives were quite as Conservative as ever. "Undoubtedly there are points upon which, if they came forward, we should be compelled to differ from our allies, or from some of our allies among the Liberal Unionists; but, fortunately, these points are in the background." "The straightforwardness and simplicity of intention with which we have been met by Lord Hartington and those who follow him have made co-operation with them a very easy task indeed." Mr. Mundella, said Lord Salisbury, had charged the Conservatives with masquerading in other people's principles and other people's clothes; a course to which, in Mr. John Morley's language, a highwayman's life would be preferable. That was a charge which sounded as if it were made against the Gladstonians for masquerading in Parnellite principles and clothes; but in the sense in which it was made Lord Salisbury utterly denied it. And he went on to defend the policy announced in relation to local government and procedure as essentially Conservative in the circumstances in which it had been resolved upon.

On Ireland, Lord Salisbury declared that, in his opinion, the landlords ought to be most forbearing in enforcing their rights, and to take into consideration in the fullest way the fall in the price of produce which had diminished the tenants' power to pay. But even if they were not thus forbearing they were not to be plundered at the will of the tenants. "If my neighbour gives money to an applicant by the wayside and I refuse to do so, that is no reason for the applicant by the wayside to empty my pockets." He regarded the new campaign of the National League in Ireland as a campaign on behalf of a policy of fraud. As the device of Home Rulers, such a policy was especially disheartening. "Can you imagine that this great work of making a nation, which they tell you they are undertaking, can be founded on a basis of organised embezzlement?"

From the other side the defence of the "New Campaign" was left in the hands of the less prominent of Mr. Gladstone's supporters. Professor Stuart, speaking at Darlington, quoted a letter from his leader, who, apparently avoiding this special point, wrote: "Our Home Rule measures were, in my opinion,

very Conservative measures in the truest sense of the term," and added, "If I can help somewhat to settle Ireland it will be conferring a greater service on Great Britain than I have ever yet had to do with." Having criticised the Unionists, Professor Stuart said they might depend upon it that the Irish Question before long would burst and shatter the Conservative party. Liberals were called upon by the other side to denounce Mr. Dillon and his friends on the Plan of Campaign. He would not join in denouncing it. If there were illegality still he declared there was moral justice at the bottom of it. Members of the Society of Friends had at times stood against the law and undertook to endure the punishment for such action; nor had Mr. Dillon and his friends shrunk from doing the same. When the laws were opposed to the convictions of the masses of the people, as in Ireland, then it was time that the laws should be altered.

Mr. Stansfield, without going quite so far as Mr. Stuart, nevertheless avowed his sympathy with the object of Mr. Dillon's campaign; and in this he was followed by Mr. Mundella at Wednesbury (Dec. 22), who said, referring to Ireland, he preferred open agrarian combinations to secret societies, and the danger was that the Government, by oppression, would drive them under ground. Then they would take to the rifle behind the hedge and the dagger of the assassin. Liberals had no sympathy with illegality of any kind, but they were not to be deterred from granting justice to Ireland because they were told they sympathised with crime.

The year which was now drawing to a close seemed little likely to be productive in further political excitement. Lord Salisbury's recent speech had infused into the more orthodox Conservatives the hope that the policy of the Government would not be framed altogether in accordance with the requirements of Lord Hartington or Mr. Chamberlain. The speech of the Secretary to the Local Government (Mr. Walter Long), at Melksham (Dec. 15), went further to confirm this belief. He said that without revealing secrets he was able to promise a Local Government Bill, which would probably be the most important measure of the session. The system adopted would be representative, but representative of all interests connected with the land. The powers of the new bodies would be very great, and there would be a reform in the incidence of local taxation. The Government had dealt with the question of allotments, and, as he considered, satisfactorily, the total result being that allotments would be as numerous everywhere as in Wiltshire, but the "Government were not going to redress grievances by putting their hands wholesale into ratepayers' pockets, and thus providing land to be let or sold upon loss terms." Mr. Long was especially earnest about the largeness of the powers to be committed to the *local councils*, and altogether there seemed no doubt that the Bill *would aim at important changes.*

The general impression created by this speech was that the Government had determined to frame their measure in a sense which would not alienate the landed gentry; but public attention was called away from the question by the energetic measures taken in Ireland to counteract the "Plan of Campaign." In the English press the arrest of the Irish members and the seizure of the rents paid to them instead of to the landlords was generally well received; but fears were expressed that the authorities would lack the courage or the will to follow up their sudden display of energy. Whether or not the action taken met with opposition in the Cabinet cannot be known, but a few days later (Dec. 23) the whole country was startled by the announcement communicated, not through the ordinary channel, but in a leading article in the *Times*, that Lord Randolph Churchill, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and leader of the House, had resigned. The immediate cause assigned for this wholly unforeseen *coup de théâtre* was his unwillingness to burden the national finances with the sums deemed necessary by the War Office and Admiralty. Behind this acknowledged cause of disagreement with his colleague there were doubtless others. Foremost amongst these were his public pledges in favour of a scheme of local government, based upon a broad and popular representation; a distinct opposition to Lord Salisbury's foreign policy, in so far as it involved the support of Austrian views and interests in Central and Eastern Europe. On the questions of coercion in Ireland, of the coal and wine duties of the metropolis, and of the application of the "closure" to the debates of the Lower House, Lord R. Churchill was said to be out of harmony with his chief. To judge, however, from the comments to which his precipitate action laid him open, Lord R. Churchill had not consulted his own popularity in throwing the Government into confusion three weeks before it was to meet Parliament, and in desiring to reduce the efficiency of the army and navy at a moment when affairs on the Continent seemed more critical, and war looked more imminent than ever. It was, of course, retorted by Lord R. Churchill's own friends that the reductions he demanded could be obtained without detriment to efficiency, if further precautions were taken against waste and want of control; and, doubtless, had there been no other causes of divergence between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his colleagues than the room for retrenchment, efforts would have been made to help Lord R. Churchill in his desire to frame a popular Budget and to realise his promises of greater economy in the departments of the State. No effort, however, was apparently made to retain the seceding Minister or to induce him to reconsider his sudden resolve. Lord Salisbury at once placed himself in communication with Lord Hartington, who at the time happened to be in Rome. Without hesitation the leader of the *Liberal Unionists* hastened his return, and on his arrival

Lord Salisbury at once renewed the offer he had made in the previous July, to form a Coalition Government, of which he was ready to surrender the premiership to the newcomer. But this offer of abdication was by no means indorsed by the rank-and-file of the Conservative party. Although wanting five-and-thirty votes of an absolute majority in the House of Commons, they at all events exhibited the largest and probably the most compact group. Hence the idea of sharing office on equal terms, or accepting the leadership of the chief of a group numbering scarcely more than seventy partisans, was received with murmurs and protests. Lord Hartington himself, after consultation with his own colleagues, and with Lord Salisbury, held that he could best serve the Unionist cause by giving an independent support to the Conservative Government on critical occasions, and chiefly by supporting it in its Irish policy. It was, however, suggested that Mr. Goschen, who on many points held more Conservative views than Lord Hartington and the majority of the Unionist Liberals, should take office as Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord Salisbury's administration, and negotiations with this object were still going on when the year closed. Damaging as was Lord R. Churchill's resignation to the Conservatives and their claims to complete agreement, it was not without its result upon the Liberal Unionists. On the very day that the announcement was made Mr. Chamberlain, who since his return to England had been in close relations with Lord R. Churchill, addressed his constituents at Birmingham, making a warm eulogy of the latter's talents and his frequently expressed sympathy with popular causes. Turning next to the position of the Liberal party, he sketched out the basis of an agreement on which its two sections might be brought to agree. There was only one point, he urged—the resolve to give an independent Legislature to Ireland—on which the Gladstonians differed from the Unionist Liberals. They were now agreed with them, he thought, not only on what used to be called Mr. Gladstone's "authorised programme," but for the most part even on the "unauthorised programme" of 1885 also. Would not the Gladstonians admit that England, Scotland, and Wales had some claim on their services, and that it was hardly fair to postpone indefinitely reforms for these three divisions of the country, on which both sections of the Liberal party were agreed, simply because they differed about a proposed reform for Ireland? But even as regards Ireland there was much agreement. Mr. Gladstone condemned, according to Lord Ripon, the lawlessness going on in Ireland as much as the Unionists condemned it. Further, Mr. Chamberlain avowed that he did not differ from Lord Spencer and Mr. Morley as to the necessity of settling the agrarian question in Ireland, even at a very great sacrifice to this country, *always assuming that Ireland was not preparing to sever the ties between her and England, and to make us pay for a settlement*



by which only she would benefit. Again, Mr. Chamberlain quite agreed with the Gladstonians that a large peasant-proprietary should be secured in Ireland, always, however, on the condition above mentioned, that Ireland remained in union with Great Britain. He would be prepared, moreover, to extend to Ireland any kind of local government which would be purely municipal, and not of a nature to endanger the Union. "There is thus," said Mr. Chamberlain, "plenty on which the Unionists and the Gladstonians are thoroughly agreed, and, that being so, why should they not do it, instead of fighting an internecine battle on the only point on which they differed—and that, too, a point which needed delay, in order that the true solution might be matured?" In a word, Mr. Chamberlain's speech was a definite proposal to Mr. Gladstone to join him in doing all on which the two sections of the Liberals were agreed, including an agrarian reform in Ireland, and to postpone the question of Home Rule till that had been effected.

Mr. Labouchere, however, speaking for all, though not in the name of the independent Radicals, vigorously rejected what had been called "Mr. Chamberlain's olive branch," and warned his friends that by accepting it they would "relegate Home Rule to the frontier of a pious opinion," and grant to Ireland only an extension of municipal reform.

A stormy year thus closed in disorganisation and distrust. Abroad the signs of coming troubles were gathering: France and Germany were groaning under the weight of their armaments; Austria and Russia were watching each other in the Balkans; and even the minor States were making preparations to defend their neutrality or to take sides in a conflict which was regarded as imminent and almost inevitable. In this country the old party landmarks of Whigs and Tories, Liberals and Conservatives had given place to half a dozen groups, which manœuvred in obedience to personal direction more frequently than in conformity to popular wishes. Party allegiance had been strained to breaking point, and the example set by the Liberals had after a short interval been followed by the Conservatives.

## CHAPTER VII.

### IRELAND.

Lord Carnarvon's Retirement—The Galway Election—The Belfast Riots—The General Election—The Plan of Campaign—The Consequences.

THE most remarkable year in the history of Ireland since the beginning of the century opened at once with an ominous note. It was announced early in January that Lord Carnarvon was about to retire from the office of Irish Viceroy. The news

created great excitement and vehement, even acrid, controversy. It was freely and persistently asserted that Lord Carnarvon was retiring in consequence of pressure put upon him by his own party, who mistrusted his well-known Home Rule sympathies. On the other hand, the supporters of the Government insisted that Lord Carnarvon's retirement was the result of a pre-arrangement—of a compact entered into at Lord Carnarvon's own request, by which his duties as Viceroy were to be terminable at as early a date as possible. It was, however, steadfastly asserted by many opponents of the Government, English as well as Irish, that the altered views of the Government on the Home Rule Question were the true cause of Lord Carnarvon's retirement, and certain revelations made later in the year lent some colour to the accusation. It was certain that the ministerial tone had greatly altered on the Irish Question. Lord Salisbury's famous Newport speech had pointed distinctly in the direction of some arrangement between England and Ireland on what may be called the Home Rule lines; but the attitude of the Government shifted suddenly. Whether the Cabinet did or did not foresee a schism in the Liberal party, it certainly acted in accordance with some such process of thought. The mysterious alliance with the Parnellite party, in which Lord Randolph Churchill had played such a prominent part, suddenly vanished into thin air. Lord Carnarvon resigned, or was induced to resign, and time was to be allowed for the production of the Liberal solution. Mr. Gladstone was said to be maturing a plan for settling the Irish Question: what was easier, therefore, than to assert that Mr. Gladstone was scheming to dismember the Empire? This was the very thing, and "Dismemberment of the Empire" became the party cry of the politicians in whose ears the echoes of the Newport speech were still ringing.

It may be as well here, as later, to touch upon the final feature of the Carnarvon controversy. It was asserted by the Parnellites that Lord Carnarvon distinctly made overtures of Home Rule to the heads of Mr. Parnell's party. The assertion was roundly denied by the Ministry, and their denial was diffidently supported by Lord Carnarvon himself. Then came long explanations, assertions, recriminations, the gist of which may be thus summed up. It seems certain that Lord Carnarvon did through the medium of a Conservative politician, if not arrange, at least consent to an interview, first with one leading Parnellite member, and then with Mr. Parnell himself. It seems certain, too, that at these meetings Lord Carnarvon declared himself to be of strong Home Rule sympathies, and to have given Mr. Parnell to understand that, while he could not of course pledge his Government or his party, he was most anxious to see the question *settled to the satisfaction of Ireland and the Irish party*. Lord Carnarvon afterwards, when the whole business came out, *endeavoured to make it plain that his interviews with the Parnellites*

purely personal affairs, got up entirely for his own benefit, conveying with them no shadow of ministerial authority or sterial importance. It may be that Lord Carnarvon really ght so, but Mr. Parnell is hardly to be blamed if he imagined when the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland sought private and secret interviews with him, it was only natural that it should ar to Mr. Parnell to be a distinct ministerial overture.

Carnarvon's assurances that he could not pledge his party, the like, did not count for anything to dispel such illusions. ne Minister, not even a Prime Minister, can absolutely pledge colleagues, and certainly no subordinate Minister can pledge Premier. But subordinate Ministers do not as a rule act endently, and Lord Carnarvon's action, however well meant, ertainly convey to the Irish party, and later on to the world rge, a very false impression. No doubt Lord Carnarvon with perfect fairness. He thought his Government were red to go as far as Lord Salisbury in his Newport speech: as really thrown over by his own people when they adopted "Dismemberment of the Empire" cry.

ord Carnarvon's retirement was followed by Sir Michael s-Beach's announcement about the intended suppression e National League; but before it came to be discussed his rnment had been defeated, and Lord Salisbury retired from

y this time it was well known in Ireland that Mr. Glad-'s long and careful study of the Home Rule Question had ted in completely convincing him of the necessity of grant-he Irish people some large measure of self-government. The , therefore, of the defeat of Lord Salisbury's ministry was d with the greatest enthusiasm by the Nationalist party all Ireland, and for the first time within the memory of man the al of a Lord-Lieutenant was made the subject of a genuine lar demonstration of welcome. For the moment, however, chief excitement in Ireland was caused by a by-election, which it would scarcely be exaggeration to say that for ason the attention of both England and Ireland was ed.

Mr. T. P. O'Connor, the member for Galway City, had been ned at the general election both for Galway and for the land Ward Division of Liverpool. On the assembling of ament Mr. O'Connor elected to sit for his English constitu-, and the vacancy then created in Ireland would seem to be ifling importance, but it proved to be a matter of intense ic excitement—a matter which to wishful eyes appeared in to cause a permanent breach in the Irish party, if not absolute dethronement of Mr. Parnell. Mr. Parnell pro-l Captain O'Shea, who had been member for Clare in the *er Parliament*, and who had stood for the Exchange Ward vool, unsuccessfully at the general election.

O'Shea was personally and politically highly unpopular with the Irish parliamentary party. The part he had played in the so-called Kilmainham treaty negotiations, and his general attitude towards national questions, had roused considerable feeling against him; and though Mr. Parnell had supported his candidature for Exchange Ward, Liverpool, it was not thought likely that he would be brought forward for an Irish constituency. When it was known, therefore, that Captain O'Shea was really going to stand for Galway City, a very determined opposition was made to him by some of the most conspicuous members of the Irish parliamentary party—most notably Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. Biggar—and an opposition candidate was brought forward. For a moment, indeed, it did seem as if a split in the party were inevitable; but an important manifesto, signed by a very large number of the Irish members in support of Mr. Parnell, though not, it was noted, in support of Captain O'Shea, helped to heal the breach. Mr. Parnell himself went down to Galway, and by his presence succeeded in conciliating Mr. Healy and Mr. Biggar, and Captain O'Shea was returned without opposition. The crisis was, however, keen while it lasted, and at the general election later in the year Captain O'Shea was not again brought forward as a candidate for an Irish constituency.

There was some very troublesome work in Belfast during the early part of the year. Lord Randolph Churchill, in imitation of the earlier Orange crusade of Lord Iddesleigh, made an expedition to Belfast, and harangued a great meeting there, in which he stimulated party passions of the most dangerous kind by his denunciations of the talked-of Home Rule scheme and by his encouragement to the Orange party to defy such a law if it ever were passed. "Ulster will fight, and Ulster will be right," was an epigrammatic encouragement to treason and insurrection which was unhappily destined to do harm; and when Lord Randolph Churchill, after quoting in an impassioned manner from Campbell—

"Wave, Ulster, all thy banners wave,  
And charge with all thy chivalry—"

departed from Belfast he left behind him the seeds of danger which soon grew into open riot. An attack made by some Orangemen upon a body of Catholic workmen, one of whom lost his life, was the beginning of a series of desperate riots in which Protestant and Catholic waged fierce war in the streets of Belfast in which Orange and Green fought, and fought bloodily, in which houses were sacked, men and women killed, and all the horrors of insurrection presented on a small scale. The police and military called in to keep the peace were made the subject of fierce attacks by the Orange party, who applied the epithet "Morley's murderers" to the constabulary.

The riots were so serious, so prolonged and virulent in the

character, breaking out again and again when they seemed to be suppressed, that a Parliamentary Commission was appointed to investigate into them. The evidence laid before the Commission revealed a very deplorable condition of party feeling in Belfast, and told, it must be admitted, strongly against the Orange party.

The history of the Home Rule Bill belongs to England rather than to Ireland. It is sufficient here to say that Mr. Gladstone's scheme was on the whole enthusiastically received by the vast bulk of the Irish people. It was generally felt that even if details here and there might require alteration or amplification, the plan in its entirety was of a highly satisfactory nature, and one which could scarcely fail to restore to Ireland the peace, contentment, and prosperity of which she had been deprived since the Union. The most intense grief, therefore, was felt all over Ireland when the alliance between the so-called Liberal Unionists and the Tory party brought about the temporary defeat of a measure which promised so much good to the two countries. Already its good effects had been made evident in the new and cordial sympathy it had awakened between the Irish Nationalists and the English Radicals; a sympathy and affection which the defeat of the Bill did not impair.

One of the most touching events in Irish history is the departure of Lord Fitzwilliam from Dublin when he was, most unhappily for the peace of a century, recalled from his viceroyalty. Every one knows how the populace escorted the high-minded and popular statesman to the quays, and how his departure was accompanied by an expression of national regret which was destined to remain without a parallel for nearly a century. The parallel came, however, in 1886, when after the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Government the time arrived for Lord Aberdeen to leave the office in which he had won the confidence and the affection of the Irish people. Three generations of men had come and gone since the departure of a viceroy had caused national regret in Ireland; but the farewell which the Irish people extended to Lord Aberdeen bore convincing witness to the deep impression which the new policy of conciliation had made, and to the profound feeling which it had awakened. Lord Aberdeen was not unnaturally deeply moved by the demonstration of national sympathy which made his viceroyalty unique in the annals of the country since the passing of the Act of Union. It was unlucky, if it was not intentional, that the new Government should have chosen as successor to Lord Aberdeen a nobleman whose name of Castlereagh could only recall associations that were most unhappy to Irish minds.

The general election produced comparatively little change numerically in the Irish representation. Mr. Parnell faced the election with an army of eighty-five; he came out of it with an army of eighty-four. The Parnellites gained one seat, and that



a seat of great importance, West Belfast, which was won by Mr. Sexton. On the other hand, they lost two of their ablest representatives, Mr. T. M. Healy and Mr. William O'Brien, who had been chosen to contest especially difficult constituencies in Ulster. In Derry City the contest was especially close and keen. Mr. Justin M'Carthy, who had fought for the seat unsuccessfully in the previous year, and who was defeated by some thirty votes, again came forward to compete for it, and pressed his opponent, Mr. Lewis, very hard. When the poll was declared it was announced that Mr. Lewis was elected by a majority of three; a majority so small that the National party regarded it as well nigh a victory. Absolute victory was, however, in store for them. Mr. Justin M'Carthy lodged a petition which was decided in October in his favour, and for the first time a Nationalist member was declared member for Derry. About the same time a petition which had been lodged against Mr. Sexton's return for West Belfast was decided in favour of Mr. Sexton. These two victories in the two great towns of Ulster were regarded as especially fortunate by the Nationalist party and their sympathisers in England.

The story of the defeat of Mr. Parnell's Tenants' Relief Bill belongs to Parliamentary history, but the results of the defeat were peculiarly disastrous for Ireland. The condition of the country was little short of desperate. The pinch of poverty was unusually severe, but the landlord party, with some honourable exceptions, were, if possible, exceptionally pressing in their demands for impossible rents, and especially ready in sowing evictions broadcast. So virulent was the eviction fever that Sir Redvers Buller, who had been sent over to Ireland on a kind of mysterious military mission to Kerry, was compelled to endeavour to stay it, and even high Government officials like the Chief Secretary Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and officials of lower degree like Captain Plunkett, R.M., brought pressure to bear upon landlords to stay their evicting hands a little. But the isolated efforts of Sir Redvers Buller and the half-hearted manœuvres of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach and Captain Plunkett were of little avail, and the Nationalist party felt that something must be done by them to stop the widespread desolation that the action of the landlords was causing. In order to accomplish this the now famous and historical Plan of Campaign was formulated.

The Plan of Campaign was in no sense of the term a "No Rent Manifesto." The campaign was not against the payment of all rent, but against the payment of impossible rent. Wherever landlords made a reasonable or, as it was called, a humane reduction in their demand there was an entire and whole-hearted willingness to meet them. But it was to meet cases in which the landlords would not listen to reason and justice, and were deaf to mercy; cases in which they insisted upon wringing every scruple of their pound of flesh from

etched tenantry, that the Plan of Campaign was formulated. was first heard of at Woodford, at Lord Clanricarde's estate Galway, in a speech made by Mr. John Dillon (Oct. 17). All the worst phases of the landlord system were evident at Woodford, where Lord "Clanrackrent," as he was called sardonically, reigned over the property which had been in his family since the days of the De Burghs. Since his father died in 1874 "no tenant on all the Clanricarde estates," wrote the special Commissioner of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "has seen his landlord or secured a visual or aural proof of his existence. They have written him occasionally; notably, this year, when the Bishop Coadjutor of Clonfert—a landlord's bishop, if there be one in all Ireland—humbly memorialised him to take compassion upon the hapless state of the tenants, but they received no reply. It was as if they addressed their petitions to the ghost of a marquess; the vasty deep swallowed up their cries, their petitions, their memorials. Nor was even an echo to be heard in the silence."

The estate of such a landlord was certainly a fitting scene for the opening of the new chapter in the story of the land agitation in Ireland. The Plan of Campaign may be literally said to have been born of the agony of the Woodford tenantry. So great was the agony that the Woodford tenantry refused to be counselled to patience by the National League at the time when the Home Rule Bill was before Parliament, and the National League was anxious to avoid any collision which would increase the difficulties of the Government. The men of Woodford went to war with the shadowy, impalpable Lord Clanricarde on their own account. They refused to pay the impossible rents, and Lord Clanricarde's agent answered by snowing evictions. The evictions were carried out with unusual difficulty. The tenants stood out like heroes in sieges; the defence of Saunder's Fort was of an almost heroic nature, and will be long remembered in the annals of the war. Then came the meeting (Oct. 17) at which the Plan of Campaign was first foreshadowed by Mr. William O'Brien and John Dillon in the presence of an English journalist, Mr. Bradshaw, of the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

The plan of campaign thus promulgated appeared as an article in *United Ireland* of October 23, together with an interview with Mr. T. Harrington, M.P., the Secretary of the National League, approving of the scheme. On November 20 it was issued as a special supplement to *United Ireland*, and in that form was read broadcast all over the country, and posted up in every peasant's cabin. In the interest of history, and in furtherance of the comprehension of an important political agitation which has been loudly applauded as well as fiercely condemned by English writers and politicians, it cannot be considered other than highly advisable to print here this famous document almost in its entirety.

*'Except in a few districts of Ireland, evictions have not been*

so numerous during the past two months as in the earlier portions of the year. This is simply the annual breathing time of the crowbar brigade. Ejectment processes have been issued wholesale, writs of the Superior Courts will soon follow, and again the fell work of destruction will proceed. Irish homes sanctified by many happy memories will be unroofed ; Irish families will be scattered. One who has borne his part in the struggle of the past half-dozen years, who has seen almost every phase of the agitation, thinks it his duty at the present critical moment to offer to the Irish tenantry and their friends the following suggestions as the result of his experience. Present rents, speaking roundly, are impossible. That the landlords will press for them let the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill testify. A fight during the coming winter is therefore inevitable, and it behoves the Irish tenantry to fight with a skill begotten of experience. The first question they have to consider is : 1. *How to meet the November demand.*—In a few weeks at most the agents will issue invitations from the rent-office. There should not be an estate in Ireland where the tenants would not by that time have their minds fully made up as to the course they intend to pursue. To delay action until the gale-day means to go into the struggle handicapped. Should combinations be formed on the lines of branches of the National League or merely by estates ? By estates decidedly. Let branches of the National League, if they will, take the initiative in getting the tenantry on each estate to meet one another. But it should be distinctly understood that the action or resolution of one estate was not to bind any other and the tenantry on every estate should be free to decide upon their own course. When they are assembled together, if the priest be not with them, let them appoint an intelligent and sturdy member of their body as a chairman, and after consulting decide by resolution on the amount of abatement they will demand.

“ A committee consisting, say, of six, and the chairman, should then be elected, to be called a Managing Committee, and to take charge of the half-year's rent of each tenant should the landlord refuse it. Every one present should pledge himself (1) to abide by the decision of the majority ; (2) to hold no communication with the landlord or any of his agents, except in presence of the body of the tenantry ; (3) to accept no settlement for himself which is not given to every tenant on the estate. Should any tenants be exempted ? This question is likely to be raised as to large holders. It should be remembered, however, that the large tenant plays for high stakes, and there is no reason why he should not throw in his lot with the rest. Holders of town parks, who are shopkeepers, have a stronger claim to exemption for a judgment against them may mean ruin. But no case for exemption arises at this stage until it be known how the landlord will proceed. In any published report of the meeting

---

of the committee should not be given. On the gale-day the tenantry should proceed to the rent-office in a body. If the agent refuses to see them in a body they should on no account see him individually, but depute the chairman to act as spokesman and acquaint him of the reduction which they demand. No offer to accept the rent 'on account' should be made. Should the agent refuse, then every tenant must contribute to the Managing Committee the half-year's rent which he has paid to the agent. To prevent any attempt at a garnishee order money should be deposited by the Managing Committee with some one reliable person whose name would not be known to the agent or the members of the committee. This may be called the Estate Fund, and it should be absolutely at the disposal of the Managing Committee for the purposes of the fight. Broken tenants who are unable to contribute the reduced half-year's rent should at least contribute the percentage demanded from the others—that is, the difference between the rent demanded and the offer which the tenantry offer to pay. Thus practically a half-year's rent of the estate is put together to fight the landlord with. This is a fund which, if properly utilised, will reduce the rent of the landlord in Ireland. 2. *How should the fund be employed?* The answer to this question must to some extent depend upon the course the landlord will pursue; but in general it must be applied to the support of the tenants who are dispossessed either by sale or ejectment. It should be distributed by the committee to the evicted tenant in the proportion of his contribution to the fund. But not one penny should go in law costs. This must be made an absolute rule, for there is no principle in the agitation more grossly misunderstood. The 'law costs' which must be guarded against are the cost of attorney's letters, and judgments incurred by the landlord. To pay these is to arm your enemy for the quarrel, and furnish him with weapons to boot. In a determined fight there are no 'law costs' on the side of the tenantry, and they should remain out of the fight rather than pay those which the landlord incurs in fleecing them. Grants and expenses should all come out of common. Every one settling before the majority have agreed to the settlement should forfeit his contribution. When the tenants decide upon settling, the balance in hand should be divided among them in proportion to the amount they funded. To inspire confidence among the tenants the National League should guarantee: (1) that in the event of the trustee with whom the Estate Fund was lodged proving dishonest, the money would be made good to the tenants, and grants in proportion to their contributions given to them just as if their own fund had not disappeared; (2) that when the Estate Fund of the tenants has been expended, or so diminished as not to be able to meet the requirements required, then the grants would be continued on the same terms as the National League; (3) that this grant would be con-

tinued as long as the struggle lasted, and the majority of the tenants held out.

“3. *The landlord's remedies.*—(a) Ejectment is the most common of the landlord's remedies. When a landlord intends to seize cattle or sell the interest in the holding the writ or process states that the plaintiff's claim is for £ s. d. (setting forth the amount of money due) ; when on the other hand the claim is for the recovery of possession, &c., then he is proceeding by *ejectment*. In ejectment the tenant is allowed six months after eviction to redeem, the landlord being bound to account for the crops, &c., if not left to the tenant. Every legal and constitutional obstacle which could oppose or delay eviction should be had recourse to. Every hour by which the sheriff is delayed in one eviction gives another brother-tenant so much more grace. There are only 310 days in the sheriff's year, and he must do all the evictions in a whole county within the time. If, after eviction, a tenant is readmitted as caretaker, he should go in, but *never* upon the understanding that he would care any other farm but his own. Should the tenant not be readmitted shelter must be procured for him immediately by the Managing Committee, and then if necessary a day appointed when all would assemble to build him a hut on some spot convenient to the farm where the landlord could not disturb him.

“ Sometimes it happens that when a landlord evicts he burns or otherwise demolishes the home of the evicted family. Here the Managing Committee would do well to consider, if only little rent due, whether it would not be wise to redeem and take an action against the landlord to compel him to repair the injury. Any labourer evicted in consequence of the strike should be carefully seen to by the committee, and provided with suitable shelter and employment.

“(b) Sale is the resort of the landlord when he proceeds by writ or process as an ordinary creditor. From eight to twelve days are allowed after service of the writ before judgment can be marked. The sheriff may seize cattle if he find them on the farm, or he may seize and sell the tenant's interest in the farm. A tenant who has his mind made up for the fight will have his cattle turned into money before the judgment comes on. Every tenant who neglects to dispose of them is preparing himself to accept the landlord's terms, for he will not wish to see the emergency men profit by taking his cattle at some nominal price, and if he buys he is in reality handing the landlord the amount of his demand. Sale of a farm is not of so much consequence. Every farm sold in this manner during the agitation either he comes or is bound to come back to its owner even on better terms than he first held it. But if a man has a very valuable interest in his farm he can place it beyond the sheriff's power by mortgaging it to some one to whom he owes money. At a sale, if the landlord or emergency men be represented, the cattle should r



be allowed to go at a nominal sum. They should be run up to their price, and, if possible, left in the hands of emergency men at full price. It must be borne in mind that if the full price be not realised the sheriff could seize again for balance. In bidding for a farm it should also be run to amount of debt, but by a man of straw, or some one who, if it were knocked down, would ask the sheriff for time to pay. By making the landlord's bidder run it up to the amount of debt and costs, and leaving it on his hands, the sheriff cannot follow the tenant further. No auctioneers should be allowed. After sale a tenant is still in possession holding until a fresh writ is served and a judgment for title marked against him.

“(c) Distress, another of the landlord's remedies, cannot be resorted to for more than one year's rent. Few landlords can have recourse to this without exposing themselves to actions. The chief points to attend to are: That distress must be made by landlord or known agent, or bailiff authorised by warrant signed by the landlord or known agent; that particulars of distress be served; seizure on Sunday is unlawful; seizure before sunrise or after sunset is unlawful; or for any rent due more than one year. Distress is illegal if growing crops be seized; the implements of a man's trade; and if other property be on a farm to answer landlord's demand, it is illegal to seize beasts of the plough, sheep, or implements of husbandry necessary for the cultivation of the land. These points should be carefully watched when landlord has recourse to distress.

“(d) Bankruptcy proceedings are too costly a machinery for general use, and no landlord is likely to have recourse to them except in dealing with a holder of a town-park, or some one who has an industry in addition to the farm in dispute. Such a tenant might be exempted by the general body from any action which involved the marking of judgment against him. But he should at least remain in the strike to the extent of leaving his money in the common fund until the struggle be over. It is unnecessary to add that landlords and their partisans on the magisterial bench, and among the Crown officials, will do all in their power to twist the operation of the law so as to harass the tenants. A tenant taking possession of his home to shelter his family from the severity of the winter is not likely to escape. A summons for trespass must be preceded by a warning to the tenant if he be found in possession. There was a case where the sheriff complied with this warning, and on the bailiff's next visit a mother only was found, and she complied.

“The fullest publicity should be given to evictions, and every effort made to enlist public sympathy. That the farms thus unjustly evicted will be left severally alone, and every one who is the evictors shunned, is scarcely necessary to say. But the man who tries boycotting for a personal purpose is a worse enemy than the evicting landlord, and should be expelled from

any branch of the League or combination of tenants. On estates where some tenants have been unjustly evicted the others paying their rents with punctuality, while they expect public and shopkeepers and others to boycott police or emergency measures. No landlord should get one penny rent anywhere or on any part of his estate, wherever situated, so long as he has one tenant unjustly evicted. Tenants should be the first to show their sympathy with one another, and prompt publicity should be given to every eviction, that the tenants of the evictor wherever he has property may show their sympathy. Such a policy indicates a fight which has no half-heartedness about it, and it is the only fight which will win."

The Plan of Campaign was promptly put into execution although not, it must be remembered, in a great many instances. Only upon forty in all of the estates in Ireland was the Plan of Campaign put into operation. Its success from the first was remarkable. The peasantry, in every estate where it was essayed met it with alacrity, and a large number of Irish members of Parliament were busy during the wane of the year in collecting the money of tenants on the territory of rack-renting landlords and taking charge of it. Suddenly the Government made an effort against it. They made a swoop upon Mr. Dillon, Mr. William O'Brien, and Mr. Matthew Harris, seized the money they were collecting, and brought them before a magistrate. Mr. Dillon and several other members of Parliament were subsequently summoned before a Dublin tribunal for their action with regard to the Plan of Campaign. Mr. Dillon gave bail on his good behaviour, and then interpreted his good behaviour to mean carrying out the Plan of Campaign with renewed vigour. In this line of action he was still unimpeded when the year ended. It is to be borne in mind that several high ecclesiastics and conspicuous amongst them Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin, gave their approval to the Plan of Campaign as an inevitable instrument in a case in which the Government refuses to assist over-rented and oppressed tenantry. While the country was still excited to the utmost over the Plan of Campaign and its contest with the Government, the year came to an end.

# FOREIGN AND COLONIAL HISTORY.

## CHAPTER I.

### FRANCE AND ITALY.

#### I. FRANCE.

WITH the opening of the new year (Jan. 7) M. de Freycinet, who had resigned with M. H. Brisson, returned as President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs. On December 3 an unexpected vote of the Chambers once more removed him from the official bench. The parliamentary and political history of the year therefore is included in the interval between these dates, and 1886 will be known as the year of M. de Freycinet's Ministry. There are names which imply a whole political programme. That of the man who for eleven months had the direction of affairs in France is not of this category. It is equally difficult to claim him for either of the disputing Republican parties as to find reasons for excluding him. The result is that M. de Freycinet seems admirably suited for periods of transition to times when the several parties pass through moments of lassitude and indecision, and Republicans are hesitating between union and separation.

The new Cabinet in fact reflected the neutrality of its chief. The various Republican parties were represented in its midst, but the dominant shade was Radical. The two most significant appointments were those of M. Edouard Lockroy and General Boulanger. This latter was the younger divisional commander in the French army, being still under fifty years of age. Many circumstances had shown the Radicals how their cause would be advanced if they could extend their influence to the army. General Boulanger had been appointed, by the Minister of War, Chief of the French Mission to the American Centenary. He had filled the office of Director of Infantry under General Thibaudin, and had been associated in the measures taken against the Orleans princes in 1883. Finally appointed chief of the army of occupation in Tunis, he had been engaged in a struggle with the Minister resident, M. Cambon, against whom the press of Paris and Algiers were so bitter. At the end of this conflict in 1885 he had been recalled. His attitude after this raised grave comments. *He was reproached with having posed as a future Minister of War and of receiving audiences.* In selecting him to replace

General Campenon, who had been at the head of the army under Gambetta and Jules Ferry, M. de Freycinet made the most sensible Radical stroke of the session. The choice of M. Edouard Lockroy was not less significant. In ordinary times the office of Minister of Commerce is looked upon as unimportant, but the approach of the exhibition of 1889 gave an exceptional importance to the post. Everything had to be organised in 1886, and only the general scheme had been decided on. The Commissioners had still to be named, and to select the several persons charged with the organisation and inspection was to recruit, and to recruit rapidly, an army of competent authorities. Thus the Minister who held this office found himself for the time one of the most important.

M. Edouard Lockroy was first upon the Republican list in Paris at the election of 1885. He was thus the representative of the capital, and used his position to unite in one group the Republican deputies. He failed in this attempt, but showed such conciliatory dispositions as to justify his nomination.

On the opening of the parliamentary session (Jan. 12) there was no reason for any serious struggle for the nomination either of the President of the Senate or of Chamber of Deputies. M. Leroyer, whose energy had prevented the Right from causing obstructions since the renewal of the power of the President of the Republic at the end of December, was re-elected President of the Senate without opposition; and M. Floquet was again chosen President of the Chamber of Deputies by 243 votes out of 298. He was destined to gain in the coming year a still greater authority over his colleagues by firmness and dignity as much as by his ready wit and happy retorts. M. Floquet found a way to impose his authority on a naturally unruly Chamber. The message of the President of the Republic, and the declaration read in the name of the Cabinet by M. de Freycinet, establishes still more clearly the necessity of the union of all Republicans. In his message (Jan. 14) M. Grévy availed himself of the occasion of his re-election as President of the Republic to give the Chamber the most judicious advice. He recommended the Parliament to occupy itself in securing the stability of the Ministry, which could only be insured by its finding a majority in the Chamber. These wise counsels were commented upon in the Ministerial declaration read in the name of the Cabinet (Jan. 16) by M. de Freycinet in the Chamber of Deputies, and by M. Demôle, Keeper of the Seals, in the Senate. The Government promised, by all the means in its power, to favour the concentration of the Republican forces, to enforce respect for the law of all members of the Church who seemed disposed to display a factious spirit. Against this language three French cardinals protested, declaring it to be that of *menace*. At a moment when pardon was about to be extended to certain persons condemned for political offences, two murder

of a political character were committed. The Prefect of the Eure was assassinated on the line between Paris and Evreux, and the murderer escaped, notwithstanding the vigilance of the police. A few days later an engineer at Decazeville was murdered by the men on strike. It was impossible for these two murders to remain unnoticed, and they caused a strong expression of public opinion. The newspapers of the Extreme Left attacked the railway companies and the mining company at Decazeville, of which M. Léon Say was President. The result was that the Chamber of Deputies refused to vote the amnesty which had been proposed in the case of the political prisoners. M. Lockroy, who had signed the appeal for freedom previous to his entering the Ministry, was now obliged to vote against the measure.

Colonial affairs from the first moment demanded the attention of the newly constituted Government. It was decided to recall from Tonquin General Courcy, whose administrative talents appeared inferior to his military abilities. For his successor M. de Freycinet fixed upon M. Paul Bert, who, in addition to being an illustrious member of the Academy of Sciences and professor at La Sorbonne, was above all distinguished by his hostility to all religious bodies. He had been, moreover, one of the principal authors of the law for gratuitous and compulsory lay education, and had been one of the warmest partisans of colonial extension. His position at the head of Gambetta's party gave him a wide parliamentary influence; and in sending him to Tonquin M. de Freycinet removed a man whose power might at any moment be exercised against himself. This choice was, moreover, generally approved, and at the same time a fresh impulse was given, not only in Tonquin and Annam, but also in other countries in the extreme East, to the policy of subordinating all naval and military commanders-in-chief to the civil authority, and according to the colonies a more complete autonomy. Meanwhile the Chamber began its work with its usual show of zeal during the first few months of the year. In the first place the reconstruction of the various sections of the Republican party occupied the attention of politicians. The Extreme Left had set the example of separation. Its chief, M. Clémenceau, would not allow himself to be absorbed by the general body of this party, but aimed at holding together in his own hands the group of young and brilliant deputies who by his influence had been elected in Paris and the departments. The reconstruction of the Extreme Left was followed by that of the Radical Left, and similarly the Opportunists and the members of the Moderate Party found it indispensable to group themselves in their turn. They formed out of the fragments of the moribund Republican Union and the Democratical Union a section which took the name of Unionists of the Left. The number of their followers at the outset amounted to 160, and increased so rapidly that the Union of the Left was speedily able to com-



mand a majority in the Chamber. They at once brought their influence to bear upon the Ministry, which was unable to withstand their influence. The Cabinet, which at first seemed most likely to lean upon the Extreme Left, was thrown back and forced to adapt its policy in accordance with the views of the more moderate party. And in proportion as it did so the protests of the Radicals increased in violence. These, in their turn, looked to General Boulanger for support and encouragement.

An incident, unimportant in itself, furnished the Minister of War an opportunity of explaining his political opinions. In consequence of numerous complaints, the Minister of War had decided to shift the headquarters of various regiments. Some of the officers of a cavalry regiment stationed at Tours had expressed anti-Republican opinions. The chasseurs-à-cheval received orders to march to Vannes, a much less desirable station than Tours. The Right took this opportunity (Feb. 1) to call in question the action of the Minister of War. M. Gaudin de Villaine, a young deputy, reproached General Boulanger with ruining the discipline of the army by the very measures he was taking to protect it. The Minister defended himself with the utmost energy, and triumphed by asking his interlocutor if France was a Republic or not, and he affirmed he should make himself obeyed. After a sharp debate, a Republican deputy named Letellier proposed a vote in terms acceptable to the Ministry, which was carried by 347 to 153 votes. The same day M. de Freycinet brought forward a motion approving the treaty of peace with Madagascar, and presented a voluminous *livre jaune* containing the history of the negotiations since January 11, 1884. The principal difficulty arising out of this treaty was not very clearly explained in these documents. The French plenipotentiaries, in fact, had agreed to add an explanatory letter to the text of the treaty, signed by Admiral Miot and by the Consul-General, M. Patrimonio; but the debate could not take place until later on, and the consequences of the concessions made by the plenipotentiaries were not appreciated until after the ratification of the treaty. Although the stipulated advantages in favour of France were not considerable, the Chamber rejected the proposal of M. Millerand (Feb. 8) by 335 votes against 111; and again, on the following day, the motion of Michelin, blaming the Ministers for having engaged in war with Tonquin and Madagascar without the necessary consent of the Chamber, was also negatived by 268 against 154 votes. Henri Rochefort took this opportunity to resign his post of deputy.

Basly, a Socialist deputy, known as an agitator before the strikes at Anzin, and who had excited the workmen at Decazeville and kept them from resuming work, gave evidence of his events at Decazeville. The discussion upon this question

Feb. 11) gave a fresh triumph to General Boulanger. The President of the Council was applauded when he announced that the Government had decided to respect the liberty of work and maintain public order; and a vote of confidence was passed, the motion of M. Laur, by 287 to 182 votes. But parliamentary discussions were, as ever, powerless to heal a social crisis. The strike continued, excited by the intervention of the working-men deputies elected at Paris and the subscriptions announced by the ultra-Radical newspapers. The Municipal Council of Paris voted the sum of 10,000 francs for the men on strike. The Government was twice interpellated on account of its interference and of the arrests ordered in the month of April, and work in the district was suspended until the middle of June. This strike, one of the longest ever witnessed in the French mining districts, showed the growing boldness of the Anarchists and the intensity of class hatred in the industrial centres.

The day after this discussion, M. Paul Bert left Paris to take up his duties as Resident-General at Tonquin. An enthusiastic ovation was accorded to him at the Lyons Station, and in a ringing speech the savant explained his views and the mission he had undertaken. His last words were courageous and, in a manner, prophetic: "I have always said that when a man has passed the age of fifty and nearly finished his life, it is his duty to consecrate the remainder for the good of others, and there only remains for him the great problem how to leave the world with honour; and I am convinced that, in following this career, I shall close it worthily." M. Bert's leave-taking was not without its influence on the elections, which took place on the following Sunday (Feb. 14), and four departments—L'Ardèche, the Landes, La Lozère, and Corsica—which had been lost by the Republican party in the election of the preceding October, were regained. The attitude of the Right in the recent interpellations had in some degree contributed to this result. In their eagerness to give a rebuff to the Government, and in the hope of provoking a Ministerial crisis, the Monarchists had joined their votes to those of the Extreme Left. Instead of supporting an economical and reforming policy, as they had promised, they embittered the debates and excited the revolutionary hopes. Their candidates were therefore completely discredited, and, as a result, the subject of the expulsion of the princes was revived. M. de Freycinet rejected a proposition emanating from the parliamentary side, and declared himself fully prepared to take a final step. But doubts were felt as to the real intentions of the Government. At this moment (Feb. 22) Prince Napoleon addressed a long letter to the Senators and deputies, protesting against the union of the Bonapartists and the Bourbons. He begged them not to confound the Bonapartists—soldiers of the Revolution—with the Bourbons, whose only aim is *to fight and betray it*. This letter did not produce the

same effect as a like manifesto had done the day after Garbetta's death. The dissensions between the prince and his so the divisions in the Bonapartist party, caused the followe of the Comte de Moncalieri—the title given to him by h brother-in-law, King Humbert—to be looked upon as harmles while the Orleanist party presented a more dangerous fro On February 26 the Chamber of Deputies commenced the di cussion of the treaty concluded between the French and Hov Governments. Two sittings were given up to the consideration for and against extending the colonies. Enlightened by th recent defeat, and carried away by the example of Mgr. Freppe the Right voted for the ratification of the treaty, and th Cabinet obtained an exceptional majority of 430 votes.

Among the other political events of the month of Februar must be noticed the disunion, on the 4th, of the Chamber on th alienation of the Crown diamonds. In the course of this debate M. de Lanjuinais exasperated the majority by saying that thi sale would not hinder the future return of the Monarchy whe France had disencumbered herself of the Republic. He wa called to order ; but the President, M. Floquet, refused to act and for this proof of impartiality he received assurances o personal respect from numerous members of the Right. M. d Lanjuinais, in fact, had only stated publicly what all his col leagues had thought secretly. The more astute, however blamed his zeal, and the result of the elections proved that hi words had been imprudent, as provoking the fear of revolution The Monarchists came to see that they must return to thos tactics thanks to which they had obtained such a brillian success in the previous October—hiding their true colours, an defending material interests and advocating an economic policy. With this view they decided upon a reorganisation o their policy, and commenced (Feb. 17) by creating a “Général secrétariat” of the Right, composed of two sections. The secr tary proper was charged with all that concerned the active polic of the different Monarchical groups, their convocations and the mutual relations, and their attitude towards the country. Th other section took the name of “Comité des Etudes Parleme taires,” and was designed to take up and study the differe measures submitted to the Chambers, and to furnish to th members of the Right the outlines of serious discussion on a questions. The results of these skilful tactics were speed seen when the debates commenced on the propositions introduc by M. Duché, M. Viette, and M. Saint-Romme, aiming at t expulsion of the princes. The Ministry opposed this measu with much energy, affirming that the law supplied sufficie powers to anticipate or restrain any mutinous attempts. T Chamber therefore rejected the vote for the immediate expuls of the princes by 345 votes against 137. The Chamber, moreove refused by 333 votes against 180 to sanction a law which mis

be used at the will of the Government, and which might be regarded as creating a dangerous precedent.

Throughout the month of March the Senate was engaged in discussing an important measure relating to the organisation of primary instruction. The laws of 1881 had laid down the principle of gratuitous primary schools for the laity, but the details of its application had been left intentionally vague. In a great number of communes where the reactionaries formed the majority of the communal council, and even in certain large Liberal towns, there existed schools supported by the commune, but administered by Congregationist teachers, of whom not a few were without any university degrees. It was now determined that within five years the Congregationists should everywhere be replaced by lay teachers. In the debates M. Jules Simon distinguished himself by the eagerness with which he espoused the cause of the Congregationists. Notwithstanding, however, his opposition and that of the Right, the Upper House persisted in its determination to amend this law, and gave it a democratic and university tone, such as no other educational charter had ever received since the law passed in 1850 had handed over primary instruction to the clergy. By a curious coincidence, the abrogation of the last surviving clauses of this law, called the Falloux Law, coincided with the death of their author. When the Ministry brought forward their budget for the year 1887, hopes were raised that by the composition of the Budget Committee the preparatory examination would be speedily despatched, and that important reforms would be introduced into the financial system of France. The Government, indeed, had taken the initiative and had itself proposed the suppression of the extraordinary budget. All expenditure was to be included in the ordinary budget and to be balanced by an equivalent revenue. This decision was the outcome of an agreement concluded with the great railway companies, remitting to private enterprise the execution of the Freycinet scheme. Nevertheless, there remained a number of public works of which the State undertook the completion, and in this way the ordinary budget was burdened with an additional charge of 206 millions of francs. To meet this the Ministry proposed a strict revision of the general expenses of administration, by which it was hoped to save 56 millions of francs, and by an extra tax upon alcohol and the rearrangement of certain stamp duties to gain 75 millions, and finally by a consolidation of the floating debt, which in plain English meant a new loan. To this conclusion was brought a Ministry which had put forward as its programme "No loans, no taxes," but which, by the force of events, now found itself led to the same predicament as preceding Governments. This contradiction was skilfully seized upon by the Opportunists, and was the principal cause of the victory obtained by MM. Rouvier

Jules Ferry over M. Clémenceau in the struggle for the presidency of the Budget Committee. This appointment had been much sought after, since Gambetta held it for several successive years, and had used it as a means of keeping check on the Ministry of MacMahon. But the victory was hardly disputed, and M. Clémenceau received sixteen votes against seventeen given to his opponent, to such an extent had the arguments of the former increased. It was from this moment that the alliance between the leaders of the Extreme Left and the Minister of War may be said to date. General Boulanger had rather been pushed into power by the Radicals than regarded by them as a natural ally, and still less did they anticipate him the remarkable popularity which he subsequently acquired. His first acts, attributable to a hasty initiative, excited rather surprise than uneasiness. The creation of *salles d'honneur* in all the barracks was much approved of as a means of raising the moral standard of the army; but the suppression of the special committees, acting under the Minister of War, was less appreciated. Those who undertook military affairs were well aware of the omnipotence of these committees and their attachment to routine, tending to create an oligarchy in the army, and powerful enough to hold their own against Ministers, and to render them powerless and their reforms futile. General Boulanger replaced these committees by others, having merely consultative duties, and composed of officers of all grades. The changes which ensued, however, in the composition of these committees were very few. General Galliffet, President of the Cavalry Committee, was almost the only presiding officer who was replaced, and in his case his unpopularity with the advanced Republican party was such that his removal seemed only the payment of a long-standing grudge. With regard to the circular obliging all soldiers to wear beards, and to be optional for the officers and non-commissioned officers, it was interpreted as the prognostic of war, only troops during a campaign having hitherto been permitted to remain unshaven. Closely following upon the publication of this circular came the introduction of the law respecting spies, inflicting imprisonment and heavy fines on all persons who out of mere curiosity examined secret documents. According to art. 5 of this law, any person disguising himself, taking a false name, dissembling his title, profession or nationality, introducing himself into any military establishment, was to be imprisoned for a period of one to five years or to pay a fine of 1,000 to 5,000 francs. It must be said that a law of this kind had hitherto been wanting in French legislation; in the time of peace the military code was perfectly helpless against foreign spies. The Bills introduced by the representative of the Extreme Left in the Cabinet, M. Lockroy, were of a more pacific kind. The first was connected with the National Prohibition of 1889, and the other brought in, in conjunction



M. Baihaut, Minister of Public Works, for making a metropolitan railway, was in a way its natural consequence. For a long time this question of a railway through Paris had been under discussion. The example of London, Berlin, and New York, the constant influx of visitors to Paris, the overcrowding of the streets, were reasons for such an undertaking. The Municipal Council approved of the project, but a serious difficulty arose as to whether the railway should belong to the municipality or to the State. The Municipal Council insisted on retaining the patronage of this immense enterprise, whilst the Government would not forego its rights. Thus the Bill which had been voted in the previous June was ill received by the Municipal Council. Meanwhile the Chamber had before it the still more important law of national finance. A Bill for the loan was passed (April 8) by 279 votes against 222, and almost without discussion. The Government was authorised to issue a loan of 900 million at 3 per cent. This sum was to be divided into two sums, one of 400 and the other of 500, the former to be placed as security for the depositors in savings-banks, the latter only being offered for public subscription. Finally, it was stipulated that a sinking fund should be created to pay off not only the new loan but the whole of the perpetual Rentes. The subscription was opened on May 11, and was responded to in a marvellous manner. Government asked for 500 millions (20,000,000*l.*), and was offered more than 11 milliards (440,000,000*l.*)

After voting this important matter, the Chamber occupied itself with purely political questions. M. de Mun questioned the Government (April 13) upon the disturbances at Château-Villain. In this little town, in the department of the Isère, was a cotton-mill, the landlords of which lived at Lyons and were fervent Catholics. A chapel had been erected in the building and opened for worship in the previous year without the permission of the prefect. The prefect at first ordered the discontinuance of the service, but the manager having taken no notice of this order, the prefect directed the chapel to be closed immediately and the room to be sealed up until the owners should have signed a formal engagement to obey the law. This step, although perhaps somewhat severe, was absolutely legal. When the moment arrived for putting it in execution (April 9), the manager refused to receive the agents of the law. A conflict took place, during which some of the *gendarmes* were wounded and a workwoman killed. When the matter was brought before the Chamber, the Chamber, notwithstanding the violence of the language of the Right, passed a vote of confidence by 350 votes against 187.

The spring session of the *Conseils Généraux* was marked by a characteristic incident. In the Loir-et-Cher, the deputy Tassin, having found *himself* on several occasions disagreeing with the *prefect of the department*, demanded his removal. Failing <sup>+</sup>

carry his point, he persuaded his colleagues, who formed the majority of the Conseil Général, to absent themselves from its sittings. Under these circumstances, the Council was unable to transact any business. A lively controversy ensued ; and finally the Minister of the Interior, M. Sarrien, was obliged to yield to the demands of the Deputies and dismiss the prefect. This concession was looked upon as a proof of weakness. At a critical moment the Government, first challenged by its friends, was about to find itself face to face with its most dangerous adversary. The occasion was the betrothal of the Princesse Amélie, daughter of the Comte de Paris, to the Duc de Braganza, Prince-royal of Portugal. In honour of this event the head of the house of Bourbon gave a large *fête* in the hotel of the Duchesse de Galliera, to which the *corps diplomatique* were invited (May 14) to attend officially. The French Government saw in this invitation an act of defiance and assumption, and it was the cause of again bringing once more to the front the proposals for the expulsion of the princes.

On the reassembling of the Chambers (May 25), a proposal, originally brought forward by M. Paul Bert and M. Tony Révil-lon, on the subject of granting pensions to the wounded in the Revolution of 1848, was revived. This proposal, strengthened by the attitude of the Comte de Paris, was carried by 386 votes to 184. Two days later the Extreme Left called for the confiscation of the lands of the Orleans family in France and the expulsion of the princes. After much finessing, the Chamber voted (June 11) against compulsory expulsion by 314 votes to 220, but conferred upon the Government, by 386 to 184 votes, the power to enforce expulsion should occasion arise. The Upper Chamber once took up the question, and, after a very stormy debate, voted for the expulsion of the princes by 141 to 107 votes. The law was forthwith promulgated and put in action. In the first instance the Presidential decree applied only to the two chiefs of the houses of Bourbon and Bonaparte and their direct heirs. The Comte de Paris and his son the Duc d'Orleans, Prince Napoleon and his son Prince Victor, were only to be expelled. Manifestations in his favour were shown at the departure of Prince Victor at the Northern Station ; but a far more imposing display took place when the Comte de Paris embarked at Le Tréport for England.

The day after the departure of the head of the royal house the Orleans journals published a manifesto, in which the exiled prince protested against his banishment : " I have confidence in France, and at the decisive moment I shall be ready." This measure was the cause of many resignations, M. Foucher de Cariel, French Ambassador at Vienna, and M. Hély d'Oisy, Councillor of the State, amongst others, throwing up their appointments. A few days later General Boulanger struck from the army roll all the princes belonging to Bonaparte and Bor-

bon families. The Duc d'Aumale, in reply, addressed a very haughty letter (July 12) to the President of the Republic, complaining that he had been unjustly deprived of his title of General of Division. In answer to this letter, Ministers voted the expulsion of the prince. An interpellation took place in the Senate. M. Chesnelong spoke on the side of the Royalists, and the Minister of War, having replied, asked if under the Republic a citizen, for such he called the Duc d'Aumale, was permitted to address such an insolent letter to the head of the State. These words aroused a violent parliamentary tempest in the Senate, usually so calm. Baron de Lareinty cried, "Do not insult the absent: it is cowardice!"—an interruption which led to a harmless duel between the Baron and General Boulanger; but the Senate passed a vote of confidence in the Ministry by 152 to 78 votes, and two days later all that survived of the debate and its commotion was still further talk about a Minister who seemed in no way displeased at being the centre of general interest.

The ordinary session of the Chambers was closed at an earlier date than usual (July 15), in consequence of the approach of the departmental elections. According to the law, half of each of the assemblies was renewed every three years. As the members of these assemblies elected in 1880 had six times voted the budgets of their respective departments, they were now legally subjected to re-election. A large number of Deputies and Senators being candidates, and anxious to be returned, left the affairs of State to look after their own parliament, consequently without having examined either the budget of 1887, the project of primary education voted by the Senate, or the treaty of commerce with Italy.

Recent events had given considerable importance to the elections for the General Councils. The disturbances at Marseilles, where the mob had broken the windows of a Royalist printing office from which a newspaper had emanated violently abusing General Boulanger; the riots at Armentières, where M. Paul de Cassagnac was attacked as he was leaving a conference; and, lastly, the dispute in the newspapers respecting the letters addressed by General Boulanger to the Duc d'Aumale, gave a keenness to the contests. In the first voting (Aug. 1) for 1,436 vacant seats, the Monarchists carried 411, the Republicans 847. In balancing these numbers, it was found that, after all their efforts, the Monarchists had only succeeded in reducing by three votes the enormous majority gained by the Republicans. The second ballots (Aug. 8) showed almost similar results, and the net outcome of the struggle, in which both sides had displayed so much eagerness, was that the enemies of the Republic could claim to have inflicted on it a trifling defeat. In the departments of Sarthe, Mayenne, and Orne the previous Republican majority was lost, and the direction of affairs returned to the Right. This result was important, owing to the proximity of these

departments to Brittany, which was essentially Monarchist. The partial defeats of the Republicans elsewhere were mainly due to the violent disputes between the Radicals and Opportunists, but, in spite of their somewhat returned strength, the Republicans were able to count 1,967 seats of the total number of *Conseillers Généraux* for France and Corsica, whilst the Reactionaries or Monarchists held 873. In 1874 the Monarchists had a majority, holding 1,531 seats to 1,481. The result of the elections of 1877 transferred the majority to the Republicans, who held 1,604 seats against 1,393; in 1880, 2,008 to 1,604; and reaching their highest point in 1883, when they numbered 2,143 to 869. The August session was tranquil. The assemblies only occupied themselves with such affairs as they could legally settle, with one exception. The *Conseil Général* of the Nièvre, upon the motion of the Radical members, appointed a deputation to wait on the prefect to demand the recall of a certain number of office holders on the ground that they were hostile to the Republic. The prefect refused to accede to this request. The *Conseil Général* in consequence, postponed for three weeks the opening of the session, an entirely illegal proceeding. Nevertheless, the Government decided against the prefect, and a few weeks later removed him to another department, and by this decision seemed to authorise the Radicals to put forward fresh pretensions. A similar incident had marked at Blois the opening of the August session, and had resulted in completely nullifying the authority of the representatives of the central power and in reviving the programme of local autonomy, almost forgotten since 1871.

The parliamentary recess was chiefly occupied in discussions on the relations between France and the Vatican, and the Pope's proposal to send a diplomatic representative to China. The French Government, which had always claimed the protectorate of Catholic missions, protested strongly against this innovation, and finally obtained from the Pope the postponement of its execution for an indefinite period. On the other hand, a strike of no great importance took place at Vierzon (Cher). A company engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements in this town had far improved their works by the introduction of machinery, and they were able to reduce the number of their workpeople, and consequently, the prices of their wares. A further reduction having been adopted in August, the workmen left the workshops in a body. The disturbances spread to the porcelain manufactories, and, as some of the workmen refused to join in the strike, riots ensued, and it was necessary to send troops, and a few weeks later arrests took place among the political agitators who had gone to Vierzon to excite the men on strike.

Almost at the same time, the newspapers were discussing with much warmth a letter from M. Raoul Duval, deputy of Eure, which brought up an important question. M. Raoul Duval ranked among the speakers in the National Assembly who

commanded the most attention from the Monarchists, and he had played a brilliant part in the discussions on the Constitution. After the collapse of Marshal MacMahon's presidency, he had for a long time held himself aloof from active politics, and on re-entering the Chamber in 1885 he made no concealment of his discouragement, in presence of the uselessness of all efforts to weaken the Republic. A Parliamentarian by conviction, he recognised the impossibility of resuscitating the monarchy by legal means. He consequently turned his hopes and efforts towards the constitution of a great Republican Conservative party, composed of adherents recruited from the disillusioned Monarchists and the moderate Republicans. The execution of this plan was met by an insurmountable difficulty. The lukewarm Republicans were suspicious of the proposition because of the author's antecedents, whilst the Monarchists placed at the head of their programme their dread of all Republican institutions, and the necessity of pushing matters to the worst so as to ruin more quickly the present form of government.

The Budget Commission assembled after a short vacation (Sept. 15) to prepare their report for the Chambers at their reopening. There was, in truth, no time to be lost if the supplies were to be voted before the closing of the year. A disagreement at once declared itself between the Commission and the Minister of Finance. M. Wilson induced his colleagues to maintain the budget for extraordinary expenses. On the other hand, the Commission insisted that the 100 millions which M. Sadi Carnot wished suppressed should be liquidated. This would have destroyed at one blow the whole framework of the budget. M. Sadi Carnot refused his consent and declared himself ready to support his conclusions before the Chamber. The conflict at length became so keen that the Minister of Finance tendered his resignation, but M. Grévy declined to accept it. The difficulty, however, was only adjourned. The Commission on the Budget occupied its time by an examination of the various clauses of the law of finance, taking the least possible notice of the Ministerial propositions. On the one hand, the Commission, whilst refusing the Minister's proposals to increase the taxes on alcohol, appeared to favour the idea of an income tax. Any agreement was thus out of the question. The Chamber alone could decide between solutions so widely divergent. Towards the end of September M. de Freycinet gave an address at Toulouse on the policy of the Home Department. He again insisted on the necessity of a reconciliation between the different Republican sections, but he did not, any more than his predecessors, propose a plan by which to accomplish this desirable object. By a cruel irony, moreover, just at the time when the Minister was urging the Republicans to unite, dissensions broke out *in the Cabinet itself*. On the assembling of the Chambers (Oct. 15) M. Wilson laid on the table the general report



drawn up in the name of the Commission on the Budget, and M. Sadi Carnot, on the ground of leaving the Cabinet untrammelled, resigned his portfolio. Meanwhile a question had been addressed to the Government by M. Henri Maret on the subject of the arrests made at Vierzon. M. Sarrien answered energetically that the Ministry was resolved to have the liberty of labour respected. The debate was then closed by the Chamber passing to the order of the day, instead of giving a vote of confidence as the Ministers had demanded. M. Sarrien thereupon tendered his resignation, and M. Develle, M. Demôle, and M. Baihaut, the representatives of the more moderate section in the Cabinet, announced their intention of following his example. In other words, the Ministry was completely broken up, and the voting of the budget rendered impossible. M. de Freycinet shrank before the difficulties he foresaw, and begged his colleague to reconsider his action. M. Jules Grévy interposed in person, and at length his entreaties overcame the scruples of the Ministers. The Cabinet, nevertheless, emerged from this ordeal considerably weakened. Only one of its members, M. Goblet, had occasion to congratulate himself on his personal success, for he had obtained from the Chamber the sanction of his Primary Education Bill in the shape in which it had been passed by the Senate. With the view of checkmating the schemes of the Reactionaries, the Republican party agreed not to discuss any amendments. One by one they were negatived without debate, and in this way, after a few sittings, the Bill was passed, and at once put into execution. This was, however, the Cabinet's last triumph. M. Baihaut, Minister of Public Works, having been unable to commence the construction of the Metropolitan Railway owing to obstacles raised by the Municipal Government, and being unable to agree with M. de Freycinet on the question of the railway tariff, tendered his resignation (Nov. 1), and his place was taken by a senator from Lyons, M. Edouard Millaud, an Opportunist like the outgoing Minister. The Extreme Left reproached the President of the Council for not having taken the opportunity to strengthen the Radical element in the Cabinet. They accused him of betraying the confidence they had placed in him. Bitter criticisms, too, were passed on the nominations made in the diplomatic body. M. Cambon, Resident at Tunis, was sent as ambassador to Madrid. His predecessor in Spain, M. de Laboulaye, was appointed ambassador at St. Petersburg, simultaneously with the return of Baron Mohrenheim from the long leave of absence he had taken when the French Government had recalled M. le Général Appert, its representative in Russia. M. Cambon especially was the object of incessant attacks from the Radical press, and the fact that his promotion was the reward of his eminent services in Tunis added to the exasperation of his adversaries.

When the general discussion on the budget commenced

(Nov. 4), it was evident that the Chamber would not finish this task before the close of the year unless they decided to reject all the proposed amendments without debate. As the result showed, this might often have been the surest plan, since in this way the Republican party would have escaped a severe trial. But instead of submitting itself to a salutary discipline, the majority in the Chamber allowed the debate as much latitude as if the Commission had presented its report in April instead of at the end of October. The preliminary discussion lasted an entire week without eliciting any original suggestion, except that M. Raoul Duval scoffed cruelly at his Monarchist friends, and taunted the reactionary party as being a drawing-room clique, amusing themselves with boudoir plots, but completely ignored by their countrymen. The conclusion, however, arrived at by the Chamber of Deputies on the general discussion of the budget was strikingly original. Struck with the contradictions which existed between the partial reports as well as by the divergent views of the members of the Commission, the Chamber returned the whole of the budget to the Commission for correction. This summary treatment of the Commission was no victory for the Ministry, whilst the Chamber might with better effect have accepted the original report, inasmuch as when returned it was but slightly amended. No attention was paid to its conclusions. The credits demanded by the Government for the widow of M. Paul Bert and for his public funeral having been voted (Nov. 13), notwithstanding the opposition of Bishop Freppel and of the Bonapartist deputy M. Delafosse, a bitter enemy to any extension of the colonies, M. de Freycinet's next difficulty was to choose a successor to the deceased governor. There was no question on the occasion between a military or a naval officer; rightly or wrongly, the public demanded a civil resident. The difficulty of selecting was extreme, owing to the unsuitableness of the candidates. As M. de Freycinet described his position, "Those to whom I offer it decline, and those who offer themselves I am obliged to refuse." The candidature of M. Jules Ferry was never regarded as serious. M. Maurice Rouvier, President of the Commission on the Budget, although distinctly urged to accept the office, after much hesitation declined, as did also M. Massicault, Préfet du Rhone. It was next offered to M. Bihourd, recently appointed Resident at Tunis in succession to M. Cambon; and he, accepting it, was replaced by M. Massicault, who in his turn was replaced at Lyons by the brother of his predecessor, M. Cambon, formerly Préfet du Nord. These appointments were not so inoffensive as appeared at first sight. The changes, moreover, did not stop there, for M. Cazelles, prefect at the Bouches du Rhône, replaced M. Bihourd at the Home Office, and, having filled that post for six weeks, received a *fine sinecure*, being made "Trésorier-payeur Général" of a department; whilst, on the other hand, M. Cambon

was replaced at the prefecture of Lille by an unattached prefect M. Saisset Schneider. When these shiftings were complete little advantage could be discovered. Important posts, both the Home Office and in many departments, had changed however, in the space of a month, to the obvious detriment of the governmental machine. The fruit of this policy was not yet maturing. The proposition to abolish the French embassy to the Pope was rejected by only 288 to 258 votes (Nov. 26), the smallest majority ever given on this favourite subject of contention between the clericals and anti-clericals. The Vatican was deeply impressed by the vote, and it was taken as a signal that the question of the separation of State and Church would shortly be brought forward in France, and that partisans of that measure were rapidly increasing. After this interlude, the Chamber once more resumed the consideration of the budget. In vain M. Freycinet implored the Deputies to bestir themselves. The Chamber examined each amendment with cautious deliberation. Orators new to the Palais Bourbon made themselves a reputation by urging and obtaining unexpected reductions. A measure for small economies had taken possession of the Assembly. They cut down the estimates of each department at random; they struck out of both the central and departmental administration important duties without considering the grave distances that these suppressions might cause. In vain the Ministers protested against such dangerous precedents. M. de Freycinet, M. Goblet, and M. Sarrien in turn interfered and expressed their opinion that the season being so far advanced the budget of 1887 could only be regarded as a budget of expectancy, and that patriotism suggested it should be voted as presented. The budget of 1888 should be produced early, and might be subjected to the closest scrutiny. It seemed, moreover, contrary to all the rules of rational government to make administrative reforms without a previously settled plan, or upon no definite system, merely striking out votes which obliged the Ministers to suspend the service. The Minister of War alone had the good fortune to pass his budget without reduction. Other ministers were less fortunate; for instance, the Chamber having only a small majority voted the salary of the Under-Secretary for the Home Department, M. Bernard, he tendered his resignation, and the three other Under-Secretaries of State—M. Peytral (Finance), M. de Laporte (Colonies), M. Turquet (Fine Arts)—taking the vote as a censure on their functions, also resigned. This little crisis was the prelude to a greater one which declared itself in a most unexpected manner.

Deputies were languidly discussing (Dec. 3) the Home Office Estimates, insisting here and there upon reductions, to which the Government submitted without conviction, when suddenly six deputies of the Right—M. Raoul Duval, M. Berger, M. Faivre, M. Merlet, M. Lecoindre, M. Boucher, and M. Lecoq—*deputies, with the exception of the first named, totally unknown*

presented an amendment for the reduction of the proposed vote by 1,143,000 frs., the sum required for the salaries of the under-prefects. Upon this, the oldest member of the Radical delegation of the Seine-et-Oise, M. Colfavru, a former representative of the people under the second republic, proposed another amendment in slightly different and vaguer terms, but aiming at the same object. But, on the ruling of the President that their amendment merely stated a general proposition, M. Colfavru and his young colleagues rallied to the amendment of M. Raoul Duval. This coalition between the Extreme Left and the Right was keenly criticised by M. Sarrien, Minister of the Home Department, and M. de Freycinet. The latter undertook to present speedily a law with which the Home Minister had been occupied many months, and by which not only a certain number of sous-préfets would be abolished, but all the machinery of such administration would be swept away. He ended his speech with these words: "By a single stroke of the pen to assert that from the first day of the new year the central power will cease to be represented in every commune of France is, and I do not hesitate to say, not only compromising the Administration, but is dangerous for the Republic itself." After a reply from M. Doudeville Maillefeu, Radical deputy of the Seine, the amendment of M. Raoul Duval was put to the vote and passed by 362 against 249. The outcome of this coalition was a surprise to all. The votes of M. Clémenceau and of M. Cassagnac had been placed in the same urn, but M. Clémenceau and his friends never guessed that even if they united with the deputies of the Right they could obtain a majority. When, therefore, on the result being declared, M. de Freycinet rose from the Ministerial bench and moved the adjournment of the House in order to give Government time to deliberate, there was a general movement of surprise in many quarters. The same evening M. de Freycinet placed his resignation and that of the whole Cabinet in the hands of M. Grévy. The President of the Republic urged the Chief Minister to reconsider his decision. The deputies and journals of the Extreme Left, recognising the deplorable effect produced on the whole country by this unexpected resolution, urged M. de Freycinet to resume the direction of affairs. Extra parliamentary meetings were held and negotiations entered into, but M. de Freycinet remained firm and would not reconsider his position. A curious spectacle was witnessed. Those who by their votes had overthrown the former Cabinet now called upon M. Grévy to fill up the places of the outgoing Ministers. The President, however, was not to be hurried. Moreover, at the moment of the crisis, the amiable General Pittié, Secretary-General at the Elysée and chief of the military establishment of the President of the Republic, died suddenly. It was, moreover, obvious that, unless M. Clémenceau and M. Raoul Duval were called to take their place in the Government at the same time, it would be difficult to get any correct indication of the bearing of

the vote of December 3. Consequently, M. Grévy was irresolute, and having in turn consulted M. Floquet, President of the Chamber of Deputies, and M. Leroyer, President of the Senate, he decided to maintain as far as possible the *statu quo*. He entrusted to M. Goblet the formation of the new Ministry. It was pretended that foreign complications prevented an appeal to M. Floquet, and it was further said that, if M. de Freycinet had with unwonted persistence refused to resume office, it was owing to the political situation abroad. Foreseeing a conflict with one of the Powers, he preferred to give up his responsibility and be no longer Minister of Foreign Affairs. He contrived, however, to nurse his candidature either for the Presidency of the Republic, should M. Grévy succumb, or to the Vice-Presidency, should such a post be created. But, while officially standing aside, he was really master at the Quai d'Orsay, and directed French policy in its relations with foreign countries. What seemed to give foundation to these rumours was the difficulty which M. Goblet experienced in finding a Minister of Foreign Affairs. None of the senators or the deputies to whom the post was offered would accept it, and the Minister was forced to turn to the diplomatic corps. By the medium of the telegraph nearly all the French ambassadors at the different capitals of Europe received the offer of the post, but no representative of the Republic at a foreign Court was willing to exchange a tranquil position for the dangers and turmoil of parliamentary life; and M. Goblet was, after all, compelled to present himself before the Chamber with an incomplete Cabinet. At length, almost in despair, the post was offered to and accepted by M. Flourens, president of the legislative section of justice and of foreign affairs in the Council of State, and at the same time holding an important post at the Foreign Office, although in reality he was a stranger to the department of which he was made the chief. This selection was not popular, it having been said that since the days of MacMahon and Gambetta no Cabinet was so coldly received by the public as that of M. Goblet. The portfolios were then allotted: President of the Council, Minister of Home Affairs and Worship, M. Goblet; Minister of War, General Boulanger; Marine, Vice-Admiral Aube; Justice, M. Sarrien; Finance, M. Dauphin; Public Works, M. Millaud; Public Instruction, M. Berthelot; Commerce and Industry, M. Lockroy; Agriculture, M. Develle; Posts and Telegraphs, M. Granet; and, finally, Foreign Affairs, M. Flourens. The Ministerial statement was received with none of the applause which usually greets such inaugurations. It was somewhat better listened to in the Senate.

M. Goblet announced that he should follow the firm and prudent policy of M. de Freycinet. He should postpone all *irritating* questions and give precedence to such projects as were *unanimously* accepted. He asked the Chamber to vote the



provisional twelfths to meet the current requirements of the administration. The ill-feeling shown by the Chamber to the new cabinet was the result of the mistakes made in the previous week, and the situation was such that it was necessary to allow the Ministry the power it demanded. Moreover, in presence of the hostile attitude of the Extreme Left, M. Goblet, not wishing to expose himself to the dangers of a fresh coalition, limited his demands to a vote for two months' credit, and the three Republican groups had agreed to support the vote. There was a marked improvement of the political barometer, and M. Goblet took occasion (Dec. 14) to explain frankly the questions in which the Ministry would not take the initiative. As the reward of his labours he obtained a vote on account for two months amounting to 665,519,253 frs. This amount was calculated partly on the sums proposed by the Budget Committee and partly on those already voted by the Chamber. A certain number of votes, however, which had been struck out by the Chamber were re-introduced, and upon these the Government proposed to reopen discussion at a later date. This credit having been voted by the Chamber, the Government at once brought it before the Senate, who adopted it notwithstanding the criticisms of M. Léon Say. The extraordinary session was thus closed, and "la trêve des confiseurs" began. The budget had not been voted, and the rumour of the Chamber was such that it was not certain if the votes already given would be final. There would still remain the sanction of the Senate, and it was evident that the Upper Chamber would re-establish a certain number of loans which had been suppressed by the Chamber of Deputies.

In conclusion, it may be said that the parliamentary and political year in France closed under unfavourable auspices. Nevertheless, a slight revival manifested itself in the commercial situation, and the condition of the large French houses was improved since the year 1885. But this feeble ray of hope was not sufficient to cause the consequences of the political year to be forgotten. This result can be expressed in one word—"the failure of parliamentary régime." Extreme wisdom and unwonted decision can alone retard or ward off this catastrophe.

## II. ITALY.

The talent displayed by Signor Depretis in bringing before the public each year the same incidents under a different guise is not the least amongst his claims to distinction. In Italy one year in Parliament resembles another. With the annual display of popular feeling on the anniversary of Victor Emmanuel's death, the press polemics of the year are fairly launched, and occupy public attention until Parliament meets and the foreign policy of the country is brought under discussion. The present year proved no exception to the general rule. When the Chambers met (Jan. 23), the Foreign Minister, Count di Robilant, was able

to announce that since they had separated Italy had firmly established herself at Massowah and at other places in Abyssinia without arousing the susceptibilities of other European Power and he was able to add that in the Balkan peninsula all Italian policy had gone hand in hand with that of the Great Powers. A few days later (Jan. 30), on an interpellation by Signor Maurigi, Count di Robilant was able to explain more particularly their intentions in Africa. Massowah, he said, would be treated as an Italian province situated in Africa. Provisionally it was necessary to leave its administration in the hands of the military, but steps would be taken forthwith to establish regular civil and judicial tribunals; and the army of occupation would be reduced as soon as was compatible with the security of the civil population. A mission under General Pozzolini had also been despatched to the Negus of Abyssinia to place before him in plain terms, but without threats, the policy which Italy proposed to support in the Red Sea.

Far greater opposition to the Ministry was excited by their financial measures. The land-tax, of which the principal features were described last year, was finally brought before the Chamber (Feb. 5) and voted in a secret ballot by 290 against 91 votes; the result, considering the number of interests assailed, was a remarkable triumph for Signor Depretis, who succeeded in defeating the alliance between the representatives of the privileged provinces and the chiefs of the Pentarchy. The success of the Ministry, however, was in great measure due to the attitude of the Count di Robilant, who insisted upon his friends supporting the bill without conditions. In the Senate the bill met with no serious opposition, passing by 91 votes to 6, after a short debate (Feb. 27). Its practical application presented graver difficulties. To carry out its intention it was found necessary to revise the rating of the whole kingdom, to place a valuation on every estate, and in justice to the Southern proprietors to take into consideration the state of roads &c. in the South before establishing the relative value of the same products at the two ends of the kingdom. The delay occasioned by these investigations was the more regrettable as the financial condition of the country was less satisfactory than in the preceding year. The Budget Committee was almost equally divided upon a question of principle. The majority (17 against 16) upheld Signor Magliani's view of the situation, whilst the minority insisted that the current year 1885-86, showed a deficit of 65 million of lire, and a still larger amount for 1886-87. A report presented by Signor Giolitti in the name of the minority attracted the attention of the public and of the Ministry to the actual state of affairs, and drew from the committee a vote recommending the Government to exercise greater economy. This was the first symptom of *shifting* of opinion in the Chamber: an understanding between *the Left* and the Pentarchy, with the object of bringing about

the retirement of Signor Depretis, began to be discussed. Signor Biancheri, President of the Chamber, was spoken of as the leader of this combination. The efforts of the Opposition, however, were chiefly directed against Signor Magliani, Minister of Finance, and a lively debate, at once financial and political, was opened at the close of February on the presentation of his supplementary budget. Signor Magliani began the debate by a clear and skilful exposition of the state of the exchequer, the economical condition of the kingdom, and of the intentions of the Government.

In accordance with the Italian custom, the leaders of each party spoke in succession, Signor Cairoli as chief of the Pentarchy, and Signor Minghetti. The former directed his argument chiefly against the blunders of the Government; he reproached the head of the Cabinet with having abandoned his old political allies in order to form an immoral alliance with the adversaries of those views which he had previously supported; he protested bitterly against the rôle of effacement imposed upon Italy by her adherence to the Triple Alliance; and finally, turning towards finance, he insisted on the dangerous results of the Railway Convention. Signor Minghetti, whilst defending the Government, did not conceal the sacrifices which the Right felt called upon to make in accepting the alliance with the statesman whose leadership it had accepted. He declared that the understanding known as "Transformism" still subsisted, more especially as the requirements of the Left would never be satisfied by concessions. Signor Mordini thereupon proposed an order of the day, accepted by the Government, which was voted by 242 against 227, showing, contrary to the usual custom, that nearly the entire body (507 deputies) had recorded their votes. At first sight this result seemed favourable to the Government, but the majority was only fifteen. Signor Magliani thought it insufficient to allow him to continue in office, his scruples were shared by the chief of the Cabinet, and the ministerial crisis virtually commenced at the beginning of March. Parliamentary government in Italy, however, differs from that of other countries, and for more than a month the two parties watched one another, discussing meanwhile a bill abolishing *scrutin de liste*, only recently established in the kingdom, as well as the budget for the ensuing year. The Ministry next placed before the King (April 9) the alternative of accepting its resignation or dissolving the Chamber. Before coming to any decision the King consulted leading statesmen of all parties, requesting first the President of the Chamber and next Count di Robilant to form a Cabinet. Failing to persuade either to undertake the task, the King gave way, and the session was abruptly terminated by prorogation (April 13), followed by its dissolution a fortnight later. Meanwhile troubles had broken out in Lombardy. The discontent of the Milanese workmen at the new *octroi* duties imposed by the municipality culminated in

noisy demonstrations and processions (April 2) ; the military were called upon to interfere, and seventy-five persons were arrested and subsequently condemned to short terms of imprisonment for public rioting. Almost simultaneously a strike broke out among the agricultural labourers of the province of Pavia, and numerous arrests were made, on the ground that the men on strike prevented by violence those who were ready to work.

Public attention was, however, suddenly diverted to foreign affairs. Early in March Count di Robilant had been constrained to admit in the Chamber that the Abyssinian expedition had not borne all the good results the Government had anticipated. When General Pozzolini had left Italy for Massowah to join the Negus, the latter was at Adowah, a fortnight's march from the former place. The Italian general thought it more advisable before advancing to wait until after the rainy season, and opened negotiations with the representatives of the Negus. The latter took no notice of the arrival of the Italian mission beyond staying for the most southerly point of his dominions, and thus placing a distance of fifty days' march between his camp and the Italian colony. General Pozzolini was thus unable to carry out his mission. Had he done so, he might have met the same fate as befell Count Ginpietro Porro, the head of the mission in the Harrar. The Emir of that country, Abdullahi, had some time previously had misunderstandings with an Italian merchant named Sacconi, who had almost monopolised the coffee trade at Dchaldessa. The arrival of Count Porro suggested to the natives the idea that the Italians were bent on the conquest of the Harrar. In spite of the wise counsels he had received at Aden on starting on his expedition, the Count gave to it a military appearance unlikely to reassure the natives. The small body of Italians, once entangled in the country and cut off from the coast, was surrounded, disarmed, and massacred in the Artu Pass. The Emir Abdullahi affected great anger against the authors of this treachery, and for three days refused to take food ; but he nevertheless destroyed the little Italian colony which had formed itself at Dchaldessa. At the same time, apparently at the suggestion of the Negus of Abyssinia, King Menelik ordered the missionaries of the Propaganda to leave his territory. The question thus arose whether the Italian Government should avenge the massacre of Count Porro's force. Coming just at the moment of the elections, it placed the Government in still greater embarrassment ; the Ministers for the most part in their speeches avoided pledging themselves either way. Signor Grimaldi, however, at a public dinner (May 16) announced that Italy would keep its hold on Massowah, and that the Government would decide later the course to be adopted towards the Emir of Harrar.

The result of the general elections (May 23) and balloting (May 30) showed that the Ministry had carried 320 out of 500 seats. This electoral victory was completed by a measure for

announced, but hitherto postponed. A royal decree (June 15) added 41 new members to the Senate, amongst whom were Farini, formerly President of the Chamber; Visconti Venosta, formerly Foreign Minister; and the painter Morelli.

The new Chamber was no sooner assembled than the Budget was brought forward. Signor Luzzatti, one of the most distinguished of Italian economists, was named President of the Budget Committee, composed of 24 Ministerialists and 12 members representing the various opposition parties; at the same time commissioners were appointed to examine the new maritime convention between France and Italy. All the commissioners were in favour of the proposed terms, and the convention was ratified by the Italian Parliament. The French Chamber of Deputies, however, on the motion of M. Thompson, deputy for Algiers, supported by other Southern deputies, refused to ratify the treaty.

The inauguration of a monument at Padua to the memory of Garibaldi was the cause of an "Irredentist" manifestation. The students of the University paraded the streets singing hymns in honour of Oberdank, and placarding the walls with attacks upon Austria. The carbineers sent to remove these placards were forced into a conflict with the students; fifty of the latter were arrested, and there was some question of closing the University. These disturbances provided the Government with a pretext for soliciting the King's pardon for the Socialist Cipriani, who, in spite of his imprisonment, had been elected deputy in two places; his double election having been pronounced void by the Chamber, he was, nevertheless, re-elected both at Ravenna and at Forli.

An incident of this kind, exaggerated by the comments of the press, brought once more to the surface the questions of Irredentism and of the Triple Alliance. The elections had increased the influence of Count di Robilant, and consequently the chances of the fresh adherence of Italy to the Austro-Prussian alliance. In the earlier part of the year Italy had apparently adapted her international policy to that of Germany, consequently the rumour of Count di Robilant's visit to Vienna was regarded as proof that that alliance would be maintained. The importance attached to such a journey was in any case out of proportion with the results to be anticipated from it. Nevertheless, Count di Robilant thought it more advisable to remain in Italy, and the Italian ambassadors at Vienna and Berlin were directed to discover in what way Italy could reap most advantage from the renewal of the alliance.

During the parliamentary recess the centre of Italian political action was the Vatican rather than the Quirinal. The convention signed between China and the Holy See had stipulated for the despatch to Peking of an Apostolic Delegate who would have charge of the interests of foreign and native Christians. Hitherto



France had exercised an exclusive protectorate over the Catholic missions, and Count Lefebvre de Behaine protested energetically in the name of his Government against this encroachment. In the negotiations which followed M. de Freycinet displayed the resources of his talent, and finally the Pope, who had already named Monseigneur Agliardi, gave way to the wishes of France. In these negotiations Leo XIII. had given fresh evidence of his prudence and circumspection, for it can scarcely be doubted that France would have replied to the departure of Monseigneur Agliardi for Peking by the recall of its ambassador at the Vatican. This rupture of diplomatic relations would have been followed by the immediate suppression of the vote for the embassy (a subject of annual criticism), to be followed rapidly by the denunciation of the Concordat and the separation of Church and State.

The bitterness of this check to the Papal diplomacy was somewhat softened by its successes elsewhere. A convention was signed (Aug. 20) between Cardinal Jacobini and the private secretary of Prince Nicholas, entrusting the care of the Montenegrin Catholics to a prelate enjoying freedom of action whilst being officially recognised by the Government; similarly Portugal was induced to make great concessions to the Vatican in order to obtain its patronage for her missionaries in her Eastern colonies. In America the difficulties pending between the Vatican and certain American States like Columbia and Nicaragua were discussed in a spirit of sincere conciliation. A circular was addressed by Cardinal Jacobini to all the papal nuncios enjoining them to establish good relations with the Governments to which they were accredited, and to study the principal political and ecclesiastical questions in the respective countries. A few days later (Nov. 12) a second note, couched in very different tone, was despatched to the various nuncios with orders to read it to the Foreign Ministers of their respective courts. In this document the Cardinal declared that the situation of the Pope, both as chief of the Pontifical States and of the Catholic Church, was rendered intolerable by the anti-clerical congresses held in Italy. This protest was, it was said, the result of secret negotiations with Germany and Austria on the subject of the eventual restoration of the temporal power. Although these negotiations came to no practical result in the course of the year, a decided improvement in the political position of the Pope made itself felt. By tact and skill Leo XIII. had acquired a moral authority out of all proportion with his material resources, for the year, which saw his increased influence with Governments, witnessed also a falling off of a million and a half of lire in Peter's pence. The College of Cardinals struck by this symptom, took into consideration the position of the Holy See with regard to the Italian Government. In the course of discussion the old question of the removal of the seat of the Papacy from Rome was revived, but no decision was come to beyond the despatch of a circular to the Governments of Bavaria

Austria-Hungary, Spain, and Portugal, declaring that events had shown it to be impossible to maintain at Rome the sovereign Pontiff side by side with another sovereign.

The autumn session of the Italian Parliament opened (Nov. 17) with the prospect of plenty of work. The discussion on the Budget had from time to time been adjourned, and since July 1 expenditure and taxation had alike been wholly provisional. But a fresh political evolution on the part of Signor Minghetti disturbed for a while the course of business. The chief of the Old Right manifested a greater disposition to support the Ministers, and they, in return, inclined more and more towards the Right. This change of attitude showed itself at the very outset of the session, when the attitude of Italy towards foreign Powers was brought forward on the motion of Signor Santa-Onofrio, and followed up by Signor Della Valle. In reply Count di Robilant (Nov. 24) declared that "his Majesty's Government associates itself with the pacific policy of the two empires of Central Europe. It will continue this association in the same manner and to the same extent, devoting itself to the greater development of their reciprocal interests. With England the Government maintains, and will apply itself to strengthen more and more, if events require it, the bonds of that close friendship which is a tradition of Italian policy, and which neither the course of time nor the vicissitudes of the future can relax." Both the deputies above-named declared themselves perfectly satisfied with these explanations, and nearly every organ in the press, irrespective of party, reproduced and approved the Ministerial programme. Alone *La Riforma*, the organ of Signor Crispi, hinted that the declarations of the Minister were better in form than in matter; but Signor Crispi, then recovering from his prolonged attack of Gallophobia, was preparing for his party a fresh evolution towards a French alliance. Meanwhile disquieting rumours were sedulously set afloat respecting the inadequate state of both the naval and military forces of the country. At a meeting of the majority (Nov. 24) the deputy Ruspoli pressed the Government on this point. General Ricotti and Admiral Brun solemnly protested that the services were ready for every eventuality, but that in order to enable Italy to take the offensive in three or four years it would be necessary to make considerably larger provisions. These declarations of official optimism, which the subsequent events were to refute, contrasted in a marked way with the revelations on the "Morale of the Italian Army," a pamphlet which had attracted considerable attention during the earlier part of the year. According to the author, "the Italian army exists, but it possesses no soldiers, and our military system runs the danger of falling into ruin before its completion."

In the Chamber, the first skirmish took place over the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce. In the

report of the committee, Signor Lucca, the reporter, had criticised somewhat severely Signor Grimaldi's policy, especially his silence with reference to the intentions of the Government as to the renewal of the commercial treaties with France and Austria-Hungary. Signor Grimaldi took refuge behind the Commission on Customs Tariffs, which had not yet published its report; but in reality he was waiting to see whether the French Government would denounce the treaty, as many French deputies seemed to desire. The army estimates were passed with little or no discussion, and those for the diplomatic services after a short debate by 219 to 34.

At length (Dec. 19) Signor Magliani was able to bring under discussion the financial position of the kingdom. He reminded the Chamber that for the year ending June 30, 1886, a deficit of 64,000,000 lire had been anticipated, but that, thanks to a happy combination, the receipts had been increased by 37,000,000 lire, and that by reductions in the expenditure the Budget had completely balanced itself. Still more favourable results might have been obtained had not certain provinces been visited by cholera. The future, according to Signor Magliani, was even more satisfactory. The Budget for 1886-87 would, in consequence of certain skilful financing, show a surplus of 27,000,000 lire, together with a permanent reduction of 15,000,000 lire on the interest of the debt. In the course of the year it was intended to bring in a bill for the conversion of the 5 per cent. rentes into a  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. stock; and in conclusion the Minister held out to the House that it might be found possible to reduce by a second tenth the land-tax. Unfortunately the carrying out of these proposals depended more or less on the success of the colonial policy on which Italy had recently embarked, and on this point there was room for anxiety. The actual figures of the ordinary Budget, 1886-87, as it was finally voted by the Chamber, showed receipts amounting to 1,719,627,139 lire; and expenditure, 1,700,229,660 lire, or a surplus of nearly three-quarters of a million sterling. In Italy, as in other Continental States, the demands of the War Department and of the interest of the debt absorbed between them the greater portion of the national revenue, the army services requiring 220,000,000 lire for ordinary and 37,000,000 lire for extraordinary expenses.

As compared with the figures of 1880, those of the actual Budget were not without interest. In the former year the army estimates included 181,000,000 lire for ordinary and 9,000,000 for extraordinary expenditure; and the number of effective troops for the entire kingdom was set down at 1,544,000 men, of whom 737,000 composed the active army. In 1886-87 the war budget had risen, as above stated, to 257,000,000, which was required to maintain a total force of 2,387,000, of whom 892,000 were with their regiments.

It is impossible to pass without remark the loss sustained by King and country in the death of Signor Minghetti (Dec. 9), whom the funeral honours accorded to the other founders of Italian liberty were voted by acclamation. The sittings of both Chambers were, in respect for his memory, suspended for three days; the flag which floated over the building on the Montecitorio, where his voice had been so often heard on the side of justice, forbearance, patriotism, and self-sacrifice, was bound with black, and the president's seat hung with black. More practical, however, was the vote that his speeches should be collected and printed at the cost of the State, and circulated throughout the Kingdom to which he had rendered such signal services.

## CHAPTER II.

### GERMANY AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

#### I. GERMANY.

The question of the Germanisation of the Poles in Prussia gave rise to some animated debates in the Prussian Parliament at the beginning of the year. On January 28 a motion expressing disapproval of the action of the Government in the matter was brought in by the National Liberals and Conservatives, with the object of counteracting the hostile interpellation introduced in the German Parliament on the subject on December 1, 1885 (*FRANKFURT REGISTER*, 1885, p. 234). Prince Bismarck, who spoke for two hours, placed the whole question on the basis of international policy. He contended that the action of the Prussian Government towards the Poles since 1815 had been an uninterrupted series of blunders, culminating in the philanthropical promises of 1848. The proclamation of King Frederick William III. on the incorporation of the Polish provinces into Prussia in 1806 was in itself a great mistake, as it contained promises which could not be fulfilled. It was only a declaration of the intentions and the principles of his Government, and was not in any sense equivalent to an undertaking never to alter those principles, whatever might be the conduct of his Polish subjects. The subsequent acts of the Poles of Prussia completely nullified the promises which were then given, and any reference to the proclamation of 1815 was now worthless and irrelevant. The Polish rising in 1830 first opened the eyes of the Prussian authorities to the true aspect of the question. General von Bismarck, the military governor of Posen in 1832, sent a report to the Prussian Government in that year, in which he stated that, "if Prussia had employed the money which it has expended during the last fifteen years to guard against Polish insurrection, in buying up the estates of the disaffected landowners, it would now be a Prussian province, instead of being in a

condition which must impose upon us still greater sacrifices." This report led to the purchase by the Government of numerous Polish estates, which were distributed among German colonists; but the scheme was abruptly checked by the accession to the throne, in 1840, of Frederick William IV., who hoped to win over the Poles by conciliation, but brought about just the contrary result. The king was rudely awakened from his dream by the insurrections of 1846 and 1848. These insurrections led to the grant of certain constitutional privileges to the Poles, as well as to the rest of Prussia; but the only effect of such concessions was to increase the disaffection of the Poles and accentuate their aversion to their German rulers. He bitterly complained of the tendency of Germans to sympathise with everything that was not German, and declared that it was this tendency which afterwards induced him to say that Prussian policy would have to be made with blood and iron.

Speaking of the opposition of the Prussian Parliament to the convention of 1863, under which Prussia engaged to deliver up to the Russian Government any Polish insurgents that might take refuge in her territory, the Prince observed that "their Majesties the deputies" not only opposed the convention, but tried to excite foreign Cabinets against Prussia by denouncing his policy in London and Paris, adding that he had by chance discovered in 1870 numerous documents indicative of the relations which existed between Prussian deputies and the French ambassador at Berlin in 1863 and 1864. At the beginning of the Polish revolution the attitude of the French Government towards that of Prussia had been "rather friendly"; but after the negotiations with the Prussian deputies the views of the Emperor of the French had changed, and it was due only to the efforts of "the philo-German ambassador, Lord Odo Russell," who was "less an enemy to Prussia" than the Prussian deputies referred to that their action had no evil consequences. A strong feeling against Prussia was at that time excited in England and France by the debates in the Prussian Parliament; and if the recent debates in the Reichstag did not produce the same results, that was only because Prussia had "a few more friends abroad. The Poles had kept up an incessant agitation, and had endeavoured to set foreign States against Russia; but "they will never obtain the recognition of their country as an independent State within the old frontiers. They will be protected by the authorities, but if they attempt to restore the old Polish kingdom, then I say, like Mr. Gladstone, 'Hands off!'" The German element was being gradually submerged in the East, in Bohemia, and in Hungary. National feeling is very imperfectly developed in Germany, and the Germans still suffer from the *mania* of admiring and imitating foreign countries in preference to their own. The Alsatians, though coming of an old German stock, still boast that they are better than their German neighbours.



ours because they have been to Paris, and Paris was their capital. A Frenchman who has been at Berlin does not therefore think himself better than his countrymen who have remained at home; but a German who has been to Poland is considered both by himself and his fellow-Germans as a superior being. "We want to get rid of the foreign Poles," he continued, "because we have enough of our own. The number of the Poles in the Eastern provinces of Prussia must be diminished, and that of the Germans increased. The former object is being attained by the expulsion of foreigners; the latter may be attained by introducing German settlers. The funds for the Polish national agitation in Prussia are being supplied by the Polish landlords, who still possess about 650,000 hectares of land in Posen, the rent of which is on an average worth 15 marks per hectare, representing about 3 per cent. interest on a loan of 100,000,000 marks. If we expropriate for the construction of railways and harbours, why should we not do so for the security of the State? Full value would be given for the land, and perhaps the owners would be glad to buy elsewhere—say in Galicia or Russian Poland, or even in Paris or Monaco." The Chancellor then described his plan as being merely to acquire such Polish estates as may become free, and to farm them out to Germans, provided that they pledge themselves to remain German, and, above all things, to marry German wives. The estates would be allotted on leases, but the tenants would become proprietors of the soil in from 25 to 50 years. Polish soldiers and officials would at the same time be given "an opportunity of availing themselves of the advantages of German civilisation by being posted for service in provinces far away from their homes." The peroration of his speech, which created intense excitement in the House, was as follows: "Gentlemen, the future is not wholly free from apprehensions. It is not foreign dangers that menace us, but it is impossible to work with such a majority as that in the Reichstag. We must aim at becoming stronger; we must show that we stand, not on feet of clay, but of iron. We must find a means of becoming independent of the obstruction of the majority of the Reichstag. I do not advocate such a step, but if the Fatherland should be endangered I should not hesitate to propose to the Emperor the necessary measures. The Minister who will not risk his head to save the Fatherland, even against the will of the majority, is a coward. I will not allow the achievements of our army to perish by internal discord, which I will find the means of counteracting."

On the following day the Chancellor proceeded to illustrate the position of the Poles in Prussia by comparing them to the Irish in Great Britain. The Poles, he said, are loyal but dangerous subjects, who require the greatest attention from the Government because they endanger the existence of the Prussian State as the Parnellites do that of the British State. They are

irreconcilables, desiring in both cases the independence of their own nationality. "The Parnellites think only of how to separate Ireland from England, without caring much whether this would do any harm to the latter country. We have a number of irreconcilable fractions similar to the Parnellites; some are impelled by their desire for a restoration of Poland, others by a leaning towards France. They are not in themselves a power, any more than the Parnellites are; but they furnish other parties with an opportunity for causing difficulties to the Government. Thus, in England, the Radicals join the Parnellites with the view of overthrowing a Conservative Government. In Prussia the irreconcilables are supported by the Centre, and, strange to say, by Radicals who used to call themselves National Liberals. In England, if the Opposition can obtain a majority, it takes over the Government; and it is regarded as unpatriotic to criticise the acts of the Ministry unless you are prepared to take their places in order to do better. But I have been exposed for nearly twenty-five years to a fruitless and negative criticism, without being able to call upon my opponents, with any chance of success, to take my place, so that I might hiss or applaud in the pit as they have done. This, however, is in Prussia impossible. I might call upon Dr. Windthorst, as the most prominent member of the Opposition, to take the post of German Chancellor. I would gladly see him in that post, but I fear he would not accept it; and, moreover, I fear his Majesty has perhaps not the same conviction of his trustworthiness and capacity that I have. Anyhow, when I sounded his Majesty on the subject, he did not in any way seem disposed to take the hint. I earnestly begged him to give me the satisfaction of offering the Ministry to my opponents; but he answered that he was too old to make experiments."

The above speeches elicited much indignant protest from the Polish members, the Radicals, and the Centre party, but ultimately the motion approving the policy of the Government with regard to the Prussian Poles was passed by the Government party, consisting of 234 members, the remaining deputies of the Opposition having previously left the House, after declaring that the motion could not, in accordance with the rules of the House, be put to the vote, but should be referred to the Budget Committee, as it involved the grant of funds to the Government for the purpose of Germanising the Poles. The Germanisation policy now made rapid progress, and on April 16 bills were finally passed by the House, after going with large majorities through all the committee stages, for granting 100,000,000 marks to the Government for German colonisation in Polish districts, and for transferring to the State the supervision in such districts of popular education.

Two other important bills—the Spirit Monopoly Bill and the *Socialist Bill*—came before the German Parliament this year

and on both Prince Bismarck, who seemed to have become more irascible even than usual, made several speeches. The Spirit Monopoly Bill was brought in at the beginning of March, and was warmly opposed by all parties except a section of the Conservatives. The Radical leader, Herr Bamberger, made a powerful attack on the socialistic tendencies of the Government, which, he said, strove to bring about an aristocratic Socialism instead of the democratic Socialism which is popular with a portion of the working classes in Germany. He declared that this kind of socialism would never find any support in the German nation; but he would have no objection to a large increase of the duties on spirits and beer, on condition that those levied on more important articles were correspondingly reduced.

The bill came on for second reading on March 26, and was this time defended in a long speech by the Chancellor himself, though he began by saying that he had no hope of overcoming the resistance of the Opposition. He alleged that the financial necessities of the Empire constituted the principal reason for the introduction of the bill, as he was convinced that the establishment of a spirit monopoly would be the best means of raising the revenue. He then violently attacked the Opposition for its contentious spirit, drawing a comparison between it and the Opposition in the English Parliament, which, he said, voted in accordance with conviction and patriotism, while in the German Parliament "the majority relies on fractions composed of the enemies of the Empire." He had no intention of executing a *coup d'état*, as he did not wish to destroy shortly before he must leave it the work which he had helped to produce; and a dissolution would be useless, as an election would make but little alteration in the state of parties, which, moreover, do not accurately represent the feelings of the nation. "The German Empire," he added, "may be exposed to dangers not resulting from home affairs. A century ago nobody believed that that Empire, which had existed for a thousand years, was so near its end, and who can guarantee to-day that we may not have to succumb to the red flag? We do not know what may happen in France. We hope that peace will not be endangered for a long time, but even at the risk of losing my reputation as a diplomatist and statesman I must confess that in the spring of 1870 I did not foresee or fear the war which came a few months later. If any such danger should again threaten us, I want Germany to be at the height of her power. We have had peace for fifteen years, but the nation is not yet fully prepared, and I hasten on these reforms in order that the Empire may really stand fast if war should come to test our firmness." The Chancellor concluded by stating that if the monopoly were rejected he would introduce a bill taxing the consumption of spirits. As was to be expected, the Prince's remarks about a *coup d'état* only embittered the hostile feeling in the House, and Herr Richter, the leader of the New Liberals, sneeringly

remarked that if he had no better institution than the Reichstag to propose he should not attack it. The rejection of the bill has, however, all along been a foregone conclusion, and after a second day's debate only three members voted for the bill, while 1 voted against it.

The debate on the Socialist law (March 30 and 31), which was ultimately prolonged for two years instead of for five, as proposed by the Government, was chiefly remarkable for a speech made by the Socialist member, Herr Bebel, who declared that the socialistic disturbances in Belgium, to which the Minister of the Interior had referred when introducing the bill, were caused "the incessant pressure of the ruling classes, which were finally driving the lower classes to use force in self-defence." He added that if similar conditions existed in Germany he would be the first to adopt similar measures to counteract them, and that he had said the same shortly after the assassination of the Czar, which was caused by the abominable system of the Russian Government. Prince Bismarck, who is always specially sensitive on the subject of political assassination, read a severe lecture on the following day to Herr Bebel on his speech. He said that Herr Bebel's words contained a direct threat to assassinate the German Emperor if certain conditions existed in Germany, as to which he and his fellow-Socialists were to decide whether they justified such assassination. "No one but you," he proceeded, "consider the murder of princes permissible, and the youngest and least ripe of your party may judge whether the circumstances under which it is justifiable exist. You encourage the assassination of princes by such speeches, and if Herr Bebel's words had not been uttered in Parliament he would have been liable to prosecution for inciting to crime."

Some pregnant remarks on Socialism were also made by the Chancellor in his speech of March 26 in the debate on the Spanish Monopoly Bill. He pointed out that the victories of France after the first French Revolution were to a great extent due to the support of the middle classes against the monarchy, the clergy and the nobles, and asked whether it was not possible that if Germany were again at war with France, the latter Power might not continue its work, or rather enter upon a new stage of it, by inscribing Socialism on its flag. The French War Minister, General Boulanger, had declared that the soldier of to-day was the working-man of yesterday, and the working-man of to-day was the soldier of yesterday; if this be true, it was of the greatest importance for the security of the State that the propagation of socialistic ideas should be prevented as much as possible. The Socialist Bill, prolonging the laws against the Socialists to September 30, 1888, was passed on April 2 by a majority of 169 to 137.

On June 10 Europe was astonished by the news that King *Louis II.* of Bavaria had been declared insane, and that Prince *Luitpold*, his uncle, had assumed the regency and the command of the Bavarian army, as the King's brother, Prince Otto

suffering from the same malady. A proclamation, dated the previous day, was issued by the King, announcing that Prince Luitpold intended to raise himself to the regency against the King's will, that his Ministers had deceived the people with untrue statements as to his health, and that he was "bodily and mentally as well as any other monarch," and concluding with an appeal to the Bavarian people and the whole German nation and the allied princes to "help to frustrate this treason to King and Fatherland." Several Bavarian medical professors at the same time denied that the King was insane; but the question was soon set at rest by his suicide in the Lake of Starnberg, to which place he had been moved from Hohenschwangau on June 12. On Sunday evening he went for a walk in the park near the lake, accompanied by his physician, Dr. Gudden. Neither of them having returned by nightfall, a search was made in the park. The body of Dr. Gudden was found in shallow water near the shore, and that of the King floating on the surface. It was evident from the marks on Dr. Gudden's body and on the clay bottom of the lake that the King first drowned Dr. Gudden and then himself. The event produced much excitement in the country, where King Louis, notwithstanding his eccentricities, was very popular among the lower classes, though his mania for building palaces and his refusal to perform any of the duties of a sovereign had caused many difficulties to his Ministers.

The regency of Prince Luitpold was established without any disturbance, and was readily recognised by the German Emperor. The Prince, although a strong Catholic, had always been in high favour at the Prussian Court. His mother was a niece of Queen Louisa, the mother of the Emperor William, and he took part in the war of 1870–71 as an officer of the headquarters staff, in which capacity he was present at the proclamation of the Empire at Versailles on January 17, 1871. Since then he had always opposed all ultramontane measures, and loyally supported the new *régime*, though its policy has often not been in accordance with his political traditions. The moderate Liberal Cabinet of Baron von Lutz, which had been appointed by the late king, was retained in office by the Regent, and the solution of the dispute between Germany and the Vatican, which practically closed the Kulturkampf, would in any case have rendered any change of Ministers unnecessary, so far as the Regent's religious views were concerned. In order, however, to leave no doubt as to his intentions with regard to the Ministry, he addressed a letter to them on July 7, expressing his full confidence in the Premier, and requesting him and all his colleagues to continue to conduct the affairs of the country. "The protection of religion and the maintenance of peace among the various creeds," he said in this document, "is in my opinion of paramount importance, and I especially rejoice that the highest ecclesiastical authority" (i.e. the Pope) "has repeatedly expressed his entire satisfaction at the condition of the Catholic Church in Bavaria."



The passing by a majority of 260 to 108 of the bill "revising the politico-ecclesiastical laws," which took place on May 10, finally sealed the reconciliation between the Prussian Government and the Vatican which had been in progress since the accession of Pope Leo XIII. (ANNUAL REGISTER, 1882, p. 239; 1883, p. 240). Prince Bismarck did not, as his adversaries suggested, "go to Canossa" in eventually accepting this revision of the May Laws, for the compromise he made with the Vatican involved serious concessions on the part of the Pope as well as of the Berlin Cabinet, and was far from being an absolute surrender of the claims made by the latter to control the action of the Roman Catholic Church in Prussia. It was, however, the logical outcome of the preponderance which the Roman Catholic or "Centre" party has gradually obtained in the German Parliament, as shown in the following table, setting forth the proportionate strength of each of the principal parties in the Reichstag since the year 1871:—

	1871	1874	1877	1881	1884
Conservatives . . . . .	14	5	10	12	19
Imperialists . . . . .	9	8	9	7	7
National Liberals . . . . .	31	39	35	11	12
New Liberals . . . . .	11	12	8	15	16
Centre . . . . .	15	22	23	25	24
Social Democrats . . . . .	5	2	3	3	6

In the Prussian Parliament the Centre party was not relatively so strong, but in view of the large proportion of Roman Catholic inhabitants both in Prussia and in the German Empire it was obviously Prince Bismarck's interest to prevent their representatives from assuming the position of Irreconcilables, as a consequence of the continuation of the Kulturkampf. The views of the Pope on this question were expressed by him, shortly before the bill was introduced in the Prussian Parliament, in an address to some German Catholics who had made a pilgrimage to Rome. "I believe," he said, "that you may now look with confidence to the future. The Emperor William has assured me of his kind sentiments, and of his determination to meet the wishes of his Catholic subjects. From the first day of my pontificate I have every day thought of Germany, offering daily prayers to God that He should restore peace between Germany and the Church. At length it seems that an improvement is taking place. But it is impossible for us to obtain everything at once. Gradual improvement is a natural law of humanity, and this is especially true in the present case, as there is no unity of religion in your Fatherland, and it is necessary to take into consideration the natural opposition between Catholics and Protestants. We must be thankful to God for the ameliorations about to take place, even though not everything is granted which the Church demands."

Dr. Kopp, the new Bishop of Fulda, took every opportunity of expressing the same conciliatory spirit during the debates in the Prussian Upper House on the question of the expropriation of the Polish landlords and on the new Ecclesiastical Bill, and Prince Bismarck, in his speech on the bill, expressed a confident hope that both the Pope and the Roman Catholics of Germany would "honourably assist in erecting on the ruins of the May Laws—for they are now nothing but ruins—the temple of peace." Dr. Windthorst, the leader of the Centre party, was not so confident. He and his friends of course accepted the bill, but he held that it would still be necessary to maintain the strength of the party, "in order that it might have the power to guard and defend the rights it had at length reconquered from Prussia."

An interesting account was given by Prince Bismarck on this occasion of the policy which had led to the introduction of the May Laws and their gradual abolition. These laws, he said, were often spoken of, not as what they really were, a melancholy necessity, but as "a sort of venerable palladium of the Prussian State, which ought under no circumstances to be touched, at the risk of wounding the honour of that State." The fact was that the abrogation or revision of these laws did not involve any question of honour at all, though the contrary was maintained by the New Liberal party, the *tertius gaudens duobus litigantibus*. The May Laws were simply "means of combat aiming at peace"; and it was in accordance with this fact that when the present pacific Pope came to the throne the Chancellor lost no time in opening negotiations with a view to a compromise. A careful study of the May Laws had led him to the conclusion that in the heat of the conflict the Prussian Government had occupied a considerable amount of the enemy's territory which was almost worthless. This region comprised the clauses relating to the education and appointment of the clergy, which he could only describe by the English phrase "a wild-goose chase." He thought these clauses might be safely abandoned. The State had better cease to compete with the Church in the matter of the education and appointment of the clergy; and "if we look upon the Church as an opponent, we should only strengthen her by giving her a better educated priest than she can herself produce." The result of these considerations was the May Laws Amendment Bill which had been introduced by the Government, and he would have carried his "gratuitous concessions" much further had it been possible to make a distinction between the German and the Polish parts of the monarchy. But the fact that the Polish clergy used their ecclesiastical freedom for political and revolutionary purposes compelled the Government to withhold from the Poles what it could grant without detriment to its interests in the German provinces. He added that he considered the best means of bringing home to the Prussian Catholics a proper understanding of the intentions of the Government would

be to seek the opinion of the Pope on the bill before introducing it in the Prussian Parliament. The reason for this somewhat unusual course was, he said, that he believed Pope Leo XIII. would show more goodwill and interest for the consolidation of the German Empire than has been repeatedly evinced by the majority of the German Parliament. "I consider the Pope more friendly to Germany than the Centre, for the Pope is a wise, moderate, and pacific gentleman, and whether that can be said of all the members of the majority of the Reichstag I will not stop to inquire. The Pope is not a Guelph, a Pole, or a New Liberal, nor has he anything to do with the Social Democrats." The Government would not, therefore, approach the Centre party without "previously proving to the Catholics of Prussia that he is in agreement with the Pope, the highest authority of their creed." It became evident after this speech that the Chancellor had practically determined to throw overboard all the provisions of the May Laws except that which gave the State control over the ecclesiastical appointments of the Roman Catholic Church in Prussia. This important provision, known as the *Anzeigepflicht*, had at length been conceded by the Pope in return for the abandonment by the Prussian Government of numerous other provisions, such as those relating to State examination of candidates for the priesthood, which had been described by the Chancellor as almost worthless, but which were regarded as very important at the Vatican.

The second year of Prince Hohenlohe's term of office as Governor of Alsace-Lorraine (ANNUAL REGISTER, 1885, p. 239) was signalised by a great triumph for the German rule in the annexed provinces. For the first time since the annexation the German party carried most of their candidates in the municipal elections (July 11); at Metz their numbers in the Council were increased from four to twelve, including the acting mayor, Herr Halm, who was re-elected by a large majority; while at Strasburg the "Protest" party was reduced to nine members out of thirty-six. The loyalists had another opportunity of manifesting their attachment to the German Empire when the Emperor William visited Strasburg for the army manœuvres on Sept. 10: 38,000 men were reviewed by the Emperor on the Polygon outside the city, and the people seemed much gratified by the compliment paid to them in the imperial visit, and at the same time strongly impressed by the martial bearing and admirable drill of the troops. On receiving the principal dignitaries of the city, the Emperor stated to the bishop that he had offered his hand to help to restore religious peace to Germany, and that he trusted the clergy would support him in that difficult task; and he expressed great satisfaction to the Burgomaster at the result of the recent municipal elections. The people at Strasburg, he added, were just as loyal as in the older provinces; and he saw, with great pleasure, that, though he had acceded with much

hesitation to Prince Hohenlohe's urgent wish for the re-establishment of the municipality of Strasburg, his misgivings had proved totally groundless.

In colonial affairs the policy of Germany still showed a somewhat aggressive tendency, though General Caprivi, the chief of the Admiralty, stated in the German Parliament on Jan. 18 that Prince Bismarck adhered to the principles which he had enunciated in the previous year. The German flag would only go where German trade had already established a footing, and there was no intention of further extending German colonies at present. General Caprivi added, however, that the new colonial policy had greatly increased the naval expenditure, which already exceeded the amount voted last year. Besides keeping ships at the six existing transoceanic naval stations, the German Government considered it absolutely necessary to hold in continual readiness a flying squadron, so as to be prepared for all contingencies.

In January a serious difficulty occurred between Germany and the King of the Samoan Islands. Mullin Point, the seat of the Samoan Government, was the property of Herr Weber, formerly the German Consul, who requested the King to transfer his residence to some other place. The King then tendered to Herr Weber a sum at which the property had been valued, but the latter refused to accept it, upon which the King moved the royal quarters and hoisted the Samoan flag upon them. This was regarded by Herr Steubel, the German Consul, as an insult to Germany, and the King having refused to lower his flag, it was removed by some German mariners from the *Albatross*, and Rear-Admiral von Dönhoff was ordered to proceed with the frigates *Bismarck* and *Neisenau* and the corvette *Olga* to the Samoan Islands to settle the matter. The German flag was hoisted in Apia, but the German Government repudiated any idea of annexing that place, the Samoan Islands being under the virtual protectorate of England, Germany, and the United States. Special commissioners were subsequently sent by the three treaty Powers to arrange matters on the spot, it having been alleged that the difficulty arose from constant friction between the consuls of those Powers at Apia. The result of this step was not known at the end of the year.

Among the measures taken during the year by the German Government for extending German influence and trade abroad were the establishment of a seminary of Oriental languages in connection with the University of Berlin, and the grant of a Government subsidy to a line of German mail steamers to Eastern Asia, with a branch service to Australia. The expense of starting the seminary of Oriental languages was to be defrayed by the Imperial and the Prussian Exchequers respectively in equal shares, and the course embraced theoretical lectures and practical exercises in Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Chinese, Japanese, and some of the Indian languages.

In February a "White Book" was issued by the German Government, containing a copy of the agreement concluded between Count Bismarck and Baron Courcel on Dec. 29, 1885 (ANNUAL REGISTER, 1885, p. 247), as to the possessions of Germany and France respectively on the west coast of Africa. Under this agreement Germany ceded to France all her rights of sovereignty or protectorate over the territories of the Campo River, and engaged to abstain from any political action in the territory to the south of a line extending from the mouth of that river to the 10th meridian of longitude east of Greenwich, and thence along the parallel of latitude up to the point where it crosses the 15th meridian of longitude east of Greenwich. On the other hand, France recognised the German protectorate over the Togo country, and withdrew from the claims arising from her relations with King Mensa to the territory of Porto Seguro. She also recognised the protectorate of Germany over Little Popo, and in both territories the French and German settlers were to be treated alike. The frontier between the French and German districts on this part of the coast was to be drawn between the territories of Little Popo and Agoué, and to follow the lines of demarcation between the territories of the native tribes. In Senegambia Germany abandoned all claim to the territories between the Rio Nuñez and the Melacorée, and recognised the sovereignty of France over those territories. In the South Seas Germany engaged not to do anything to prevent the occupation by France of islands in the immediate vicinity of the Society Islands or of the New Hebrides.

On April 6 a "declaration between the Governments of Great Britain and the German Empire, relating to the demarcation of the British and German spheres of influence in the Western Pacific," was signed at Berlin by Sir Edward Malet and Prince Bismarck. In this instrument the "Western Pacific" was defined to mean the part of the Pacific Ocean which lies between the 15th parallel of north latitude and the 30th parallel of south latitude, and between the 165th meridian of longitude west and the 180th meridian of longitude east of Greenwich. The "conventional line of demarcation" was to start from the north-east coast of New Guinea, at a point near Mitre Rock, on the 8th parallel of south latitude, and to proceed along a line shown in the charts accompanying the declaration. Great Britain engaged not to make acquisitions of territory, accept protectorates, or interfere with the extension of German influence, and to give up any acquisitions of territory or protectorates already established in the part of the West Pacific which lies to the west, north-west, north or east, south-east or south of the conventional line. It was at the same time stipulated that the convention should not apply to the Samoan Islands, which were subject to treaties between Great Britain, Germany, and the United States; to the Friendly Islands, which were subject to treaties between



at Britain and Germany; to the Savage Islands (Niné), which to be treated as neutral; or to any islands or places in the Pacific which were under the sovereignty or protection of civilised Power other than Great Britain or Germany. A declaration relating to the reciprocal freedom of trade commerce in the British and German possessions and protectorates in the Western Pacific was signed at Berlin (April 10). It stipulated that the subjects of either State should be free to go to all the possessions or protectorates of the other State in the Western Pacific, and to settle there, to acquire and hold all kinds of property, and to engage in all descriptions of trade and commerce, and agricultural and industrial undertakings, with the same privileges, rights, and duties as the subjects of the sovereign or protecting State. The ships and merchandise of both States were in like manner to be treated on the same footing; both Governments engaged not to establish any penal settlements in, or to transport convicts to, the Western Pacific.

A supplementary arrangement to that concluded between Great Britain and Germany on April 29, 1885 (*ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 245), with regard to the possessions of the two Powers on the West Coast of Africa was also entered into this year (p. 2). The German Government having proposed that the boundary originally agreed upon should be extended into the interior, it was settled that the extension should proceed diagonally from a point on the left bank of the Old Calabar, or Cross River, where the original line terminated, to such a point on the right bank of the river Benue, to the east of Yola, as might be found on examination to be practically suited for the demarcation of a boundary, both Governments undertaking to apply to the districts to the west and east of the extended line respectively the assurances as to the regulation of trade which had been given by them in regard to the original line. On the east coast the German East African Society acquired in October the Makdishu territory, extending as far as Vitu, and comprising Port Durnford, a good harbour on the Indian Ocean, at the mouth of the Wubushi. In the same month Dr. Krauel was despatched by the German Government to London to negotiate with the British Government as to the delimitation of the German territories in Eastern Africa. The negotiations were concluded in November. It was agreed between the two Governments that the sovereignty of the Sultan of Zanzibar should be recognised as extending over the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, as well as over the lesser islands adjacent to the former within a circumference of twelve nautical miles, over the islands of Lamu and Mafia; also that he should have a coastal line, with an inland breadth of ten nautical miles, from the mouth of the Minengani River as far as Kipini. The Sultan was further to retain several points to the north of Kipini where he had long kept garrisons and levied customs duties. England undertook to support Germany in her negotiations with

Sultan for the farming of the customs at the ports of Dar-es-Salaam and Pangani by the German East African Company, in return for a yearly payment to the Sultan; and also to use his influence to promote a friendly agreement between the Sultan and the German East African Company in the matter of their conflicting claims to the Kilima Njaro region. Finally, it was agreed that the immense territory south of a line from near the north of the Rovuma River to the Kilima Njaro Mountains and the eastern bank of the Victoria Nyanza, bounded by the first degree of south latitude, should be regarded as within the sphere of German interests; whilst England contented herself with reserving proprietary claims to the comparatively small region extending north-east of those mountains to the Tana River, with Mombasa as a main point of ingress and egress. On Dec. 30 a convention was signed as to South-western and Central Africa between Germany and Portugal. The Portuguese boundary in Southern Angola was fixed by this convention as following the course of the Cunene River from the north of the second cataract as far as Andara, and then crossing to the Zambesi at the head of the Cetimo Rapids. In Mozambique the Portuguese boundary was to be determined by the course of the Rovuma as far as its confluence with the Msinge, and thence by a line extending to the banks of the Nyassa.

The completion of the armaments of France, the uncertain policy of Austria, and the menacing attitude of Russia placed Germany this year in a position of considerable difficulty. The crisis seemed beyond the power of diplomacy, even under the direction of so skilful a tactician as Prince Bismarck, and accordingly it was determined to prepare for all eventualities by an increase of the German army. The Reichstag was opened on Nov. 25, and in the speech from the throne it was announced that the most important of the measures to be brought before the deputies was a Bill for raising the peace strength of the army (427,274 men) by about 40,000 men, and strengthening the artillery by 24 new batteries, the augmentation to take effect from the beginning of the ensuing financial year (April 1, 1887). The military organisation of Germany had been established since 1874 on a system known as the "Military Septennate," *i.e.* by fixing the peace strength of the army at intervals of seven years. The present Septennate expires in 1888, but the Government represented that, although the relations of Germany with foreign Powers were "friendly and satisfactory," it was necessary, in view of the recent augmentation of the armies of Russia and France, to establish an increased peace strength of the German army before the expiration of the Septennate. The effect of the Government proposal was practically to antedate the expiration of the Septennate by twelve months, and at once to increase the strength of the army by an amount at least equivalent to *what* would have been its normal increase in the year 1888 on

the basis of the recognised proportion of one per cent. of the population. One of the arguments used by the War Minister in support of this proposal was that Germany only pays nine marks per head for her army, while France pays twenty-one marks; that the Austrian army budget amounts to 786,000,000 marks against the 446,000,000 of the German army budget; and that the whole force (including the Landsturm) at the disposal of Germany amounts to 3,850,000 men, with 2,040 guns, while that at the disposal of France amounts to 4,000,000 men and 2,694 guns.

The debate on the Army Bill was opened in the Reichstag on Dec. 3. The Bill was opposed by the Liberals and the Centre, on the ground that there was no urgent necessity for it, and was defended at the sitting of Dec. 5 by Count Moltke, who said that all Europe was bristling with arms, that such a state of things necessarily "urges to speedy decisions," that France "vehemently demands the restoration of two essentially German provinces," and that the object of the Bill was "to secure still longer, if possible, the peace hitherto with difficulty maintained in Europe." The rejection of the Bill would, he thought, "involve a very serious responsibility—perhaps the misery of a hostile invasion." This speech produced a great impression on the House, which resolved unanimously to refer the Bill to a committee. When, however, the committee met (Dec. 11) considerable opposition to the Bill was again expressed, and on Dec. 17 the committee offered to grant the Crown 450,000 men for three years, instead of 468,000 for seven years; but the Government refused to accept any compromise, and the debate was accordingly adjourned *sine die* by a majority of sixteen to twelve.

This defeat, though it could not be regarded as final, seems to have led Prince Bismarck to take the bold step of attempting to isolate France by offering Russia, as the price of her neutrality, to leave her unhampered with regard to her action in Bulgaria. Letters were exchanged between the German and Russian Emperors, in which the former laid great stress on his desire that peace should be maintained at least during the few years of life which yet remained to him; and, although the Austro-German alliance still remained in force, it was plainly intimated from Berlin that if Austria should interfere with Russian policy in Bulgaria she would not receive any support from Germany.

As regards England, the attitude of the German Chancellor, though not perhaps quite so considerate as towards the great military Powers of the Continent, was frank and friendly. He steadfastly rejected the overtures made to him by M. Herbette, the new French Ambassador at Berlin, for a combined action against England in Egypt; and, although he gave no countenance or encouragement to the diplomatic action of England on behalf of Bulgaria, he made no attempt to thwart it. This improvement in the relations of the two Powers is possibly to be accounted

for by the English Government having adopted a more reasonable and practical policy towards Germany in colonial matters than that of Lord Granville during his last tenure of office Colonial Minister.

## II. AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.

THERE were hopeful signs at the beginning of the year of some abatement of that strife among the nationalities which has greatly impaired the power of the Austro-Hungarian monarch both at home and abroad. The debate on the Budget, which had for some years been made the occasion of violent attacks on the Government and its supporters by the German party, took place in March, and the speeches on both sides were remarkably moderate and conciliatory. M. Dunayevski, the Polish Financial Minister, the chief exponent of the policy of the Taaffe Cabinet, clearly laid down the principles which were to guide its conduct in Austria, he said, is a State composed of many nations, none of which should occupy a dominating position with regard to the others. The task undertaken by the Government was to prevent any single nationality or parliamentary party from having decided preponderance either in the Empire or in Parliament. A party government, in the ordinary constitutional sense, would be incompatible with the principles on which the monarchy is based. It was, no doubt, necessary for the Government to count on the support of the majority for conducting the business of the State; but it could not, in view of its position, and the peculiar constitution of the monarchy, pay attention to the opinions of individuals or sections; it must above all things consider the wishes and the interests of the whole population of the Empire. The leader of the German Opposition, Dr. Herbst, expressed much satisfaction at this declaration of policy, and said that in order to prevent the Government from being induced to make special concessions to the Slavonic members in return for their exclusive support, his political friends would on this occasion vote with the Government. The result was that the majority of the German Opposition voted with the Ministerialists for the first time since the Taaffe Ministry was formed.

A Bill for the creation of an Austrian Militia (Landsturm) was prepared in January by the Minister for War, with the concurrence of the Austrian and Hungarian Ministers for National Defence, and was read a second time in the Austrian Reichsrath by a majority of two to one, on April 14. The leading principles of this measure are that the militia forms part of the army to which it is to act as a reserve, and is consequently entitled to be so treated in international law; that all citizens between the ages of nineteen and forty-two who do not belong either to the Landwehr or to the regular army shall be enrolled in the militia, and compelled to serve in it; and that it shall be ca

out, so far as may be necessary, according to circumstances, by the Minister of Defence under the orders of the Emperor and with the concurrence of the Cabinet Council. As a rule, the militia is only to be employed within the limits of the Empire; but in a case of emergency the Legislature may sanction its employment elsewhere. The strength of the militia is calculated at 330,000 men, so that the total force of the Austro-Hungarian Empire available for service in case of war was thereby raised, including 800,000 regulars and 400,000 Hungarian Honveds, to 1,530,000 men. The increase thus carried out in the strength of the Austro-Hungarian army was understood to have been proposed by the Government in fulfilment of a pledge given to Germany in the secret alliance concluded with that Power in 1879.

The chief topic which occupied the general attention in Austria-Hungary during the first half of the year was the Austro-Hungarian commercial convention, which, according to the *Ausgleich*, or arrangement concluded between the two halves of the monarchy in 1867, has to be renewed every ten years, during which period each half is completely independent of the other as regards its commercial legislation, except in so far as it is bound by the convention. The negotiations on this subject between the Governments at Vienna and Pesth began on Jan. 6, and it was agreed that, as a concession to Hungary, the duty on all kinds of corn and flour should be raised to the amount fixed in the German tariff. On another point, however, a quarrel broke out between the Austrian and the Hungarian manufacturers which threatened to produce a serious crisis. Nearly all the petroleum used in Hungary comes from Russia, partly because it is superior in quality to that produced in Galicia and other parts of Austria, but chiefly because it is admitted into the Hungarian port of Fiume at the rate of duty charged for raw petroleum, although, as a matter of fact, it has passed through the chief processes of refining, and should consequently be charged for at the higher rate. This naturally drove the Galician petroleum out of the market; and Dr. Süss, one of the German Liberal deputies, accordingly moved in the Reichsrath at the end of May that the convention with Hungary should not be renewed unless the petroleum duties were revised so as to do away with the unfair advantage obtained by the Russian producers over those of Austria. Similar demands were made by the Czechs and others in the Reichsrath with regard to the banking and sugar tariffs, on which they alleged that the Hungarians were also obtaining unfair advantages. As a combination of these parties would have rendered it impossible for the Taaffe Ministry to remain in office, active negotiations took place between the Ministers of both halves of the monarchy and the recalcitrant members of the Reichsrath with a view to effecting a compromise. Ultimately Dr. Süss's motion was referred to a



committee, which rejected it after receiving a notification from Herr Dunayevski, the Minister of Finance, to the effect that the negotiations with Hungary would be reopened on the basis of an increase in the duty on raw petroleum from one florin forty-two kreuzers to two florins per hundred kilogrammes. This result, though far from satisfactory to the Galician manufacturers, was brought about chiefly through the unwillingness of the Polish deputies to combine with the Germans in overthrowing the Taaffe Ministry. After long negotiation, the compromise was adopted, and the convention passed the third reading on Oct. 29. The negotiations as to the duty on raw petroleum were, however, still going on at the end of the year, the Hungarian proposals on the subject having been declared by the Austrian Finance Minister to be unacceptable.

Great excitement was caused in Hungary in May by the celebration of the anniversary of the death of General Hentzi, who was killed in 1849 while defending the citadel of Buda with 3,000 Croats against General Görgey and his insurgent Honveds. One of the officers of the garrison of Buda, General Janski, accompanied by several of his comrades, placed a wreath on the grave of General Hentzi, and this was resented by the people as an insult to their nationality. A mob collected and broke General Janski's windows, and an interpellation on the subject was addressed in the Hungarian Parliament to the Premier, M. Tisza, who declared that General Janski had displayed a want of tact and foresight in what he had done. This statement produced great irritation in the Austrian army and at Court. General Janski sent in his resignation, but the Emperor declined to accept it, and when, on June 2, another interpellation was addressed to the Premier by an enthusiastic Magyar deputy, who demanded that the monument which had been erected to General Hentzi should be destroyed, M. Tisza took occasion greatly to mitigate the effect of his previous words. He praised General Hentzi's military qualities, said that only uncivilised nations destroyed monuments raised to generals who had fought against them, and declared that the first duty of the army was loyalty to the sovereign, which meant the same thing as loyalty to the Constitution. Notwithstanding this speech from Hungary's most popular Minister, hostile demonstrations continued in front of General Janski's house, and a copy of the *Pesther Lloyd*, containing an apology for an article which it had published against the Archduke Albert, was burnt by the mob. These demonstrations gradually assumed the proportions of a riot; the mob broke into shops, attacked police stations, and at last had to be dispersed by the troops, not without bloodshed. It was not until June 15 that order was restored. Meanwhile the Emperor gave a striking example of his power to disregard manifestations of public feeling. He promoted General Janski to the command of a division, and he placed General Edelsheim, the commander-in-chief

of the Hungarian army, who had been one of the foremost in condemning General Janski's conduct, on the retired list. Shortly after (Aug. 10) he addressed an autograph letter to M. Tisza, expressing his regret that "some changes among the officers of the army should have caused misunderstandings which led to agitation, disturbed public opinion, and clouded for a moment the good feeling that exists between the citizens and the army. The spirit of the army," the letter continued, "which includes all the nations of the monarchy, is that of its chief commander; a fact which is the best guarantee that the army will zealously perform its duty—the protection of the monarchy against her enemies,—that it will stand aloof from all political parties, will keep order in the land, and guard the laws, thereby also guarding the Constitution. It can, therefore, only be the result of ignorance or of dishonest motives that the army, which has ever proved loyal both in war and in peace, should have been represented as opposed to patriotism, the law, and the Constitution." The Emperor concluded by charging the Premier to take measures for informing the people of the real state of things, and for pursuing the leaders in any further agitation with the full rigour of the law.

Count Beust, the rival of Prince Bismarck, and the founder of the present Austro-Hungarian Constitution, died at his country residence at Altenberg, near Vienna, on Oct. 24. Like Bismarck, he aimed at making Germany a great Power, but, being a Saxon, he strove to attain this object by securing the predominance in German policy to the middle States and Austria, while his Prussian rival threw all his energies into the task of gaining his predominance for Prussia. Beust's failure was mainly due, not to any shortcomings on his part, but to the military superiority of Prussia; and he afterwards displayed the highest qualities of a statesman in establishing the dualistic arrangement between Hungary and Austria and bringing about the abolition of the Concordat. The antagonism of Prince Bismarck, and of the Ultramontanes in Austria and elsewhere, ultimately proved too strong for him: he retired from the post of Prime Minister and Austro-Hungarian Chancellor in 1871, and from that of Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Paris, to which he had been transferred from the embassy in London, in 1882.

In November the Austrian and Hungarian Finance Ministers presented their budgets for the year 1887. Both drew a gloomy picture of the financial condition of the Empire. In Austria the deficit amounted to 16,800,000 florins; the expenditure, estimated at 521,900,000 florins, had increased by 5,800,000 florins, and the revenue, estimated at 505,600,000 florins, had diminished by 2,150,000 florins. In Hungary there was a deficit of 22,000,000 florins; the estimated expenditure had increased by about seven millions, while the estimated revenue had diminished by 1,276,000 florins, although within the last ten years taxation has increased by about 40,000,000 florins. One of the causes of

the depression of Austrian trade was the "customs war" between Austria and Roumania, which began on June 10 and lasted during the remainder of the year. The commercial treaties which had been concluded by Roumania with other countries on the basis of free trade since the year 1876 so greatly increased the importation of foreign goods into that country, that during the first few years the value of the imports exceeded that of the exports by about 60,000,000 francs. This result was considered by the Roumanian Government and Legislature to be prejudicial to the country, and they accordingly decided to give notice that the commercial treaties which had been entered into by Roumania would not be renewed. The treaty with France expired in 1885 with Switzerland on Jan. 1, 1886, and with Austria on Jun. 1, 1886, from which date the customs duty on Austrian goods was to be very largely increased. Considering that one-half of the imports of Roumania consisted of Austrian goods, this was a very heavy blow to Austrian trade, especially as the treaties with England and Germany did not expire until 1890 and 1891 respectively. Austria retaliated by imposing prohibitive duties on the importation into its territory of cattle and corn from Roumania—a measure which of course had the effect of raising prices in Austria though it was hoped that Roumania would be induced by it to enter into negotiations for a renewal of the treaty. The Austrian imports to Roumania amounted to 34,000,000 florins, while the Roumanian exports to Austria amounted to 30,000,000 florins so that there was ample scope for the new retaliatory policy.

The truce which suspended the strife of nationalities in Austria at the beginning of the year proved to be of brief duration. The regulations introduced by the Government with regard to the use of the Czechish language in Bohemian courts of justice were bitterly resented by the Germans in that province and Herr von Plener, their most eminent representative, introduced a motion on Dec. 22 into the Bohemian Diet for modifying these regulations so as to restrict the official use of the Czechish language to the purely Czechish districts. The motion was rejected by the Czechish and German feudalist majority (consisting of 167 members) without debate, upon which the 7 German members left the Diet in a body, declaring that they would no longer take any part in its proceedings. When a similar step was taken by the Germans under the Hohenwart Ministry on Sept. 16, 1871, the Government had to yield in the end, and the Germans hoped that they would be equally successful on this occasion if their secession from the Diet at Prague were followed by another from the Reichsrath at Vienna. Immediately after this incident the Governor of Bohemia, Baron Kraus, proceeded to the capital to consult with Count Taaffe with a view to inducing the German members to resume their places in the Diet; but the task was a formidable one even for a "Ministry of Concilia-

tion," especially in view of the dangers which threatened the monarchy from abroad.

The foreign policy of Austria was during the latter part of the year almost entirely occupied with the Bulgarian question. The meeting of Prince Bismarck and Count Kalnoky at Kissingen, and that of their respective sovereigns at Gastein, seems to have been intended as a demonstration against the *rapprochement* which had since the spring of the year been coming on between Russia and France ; but there does not appear to have been any reason for the suspicion which was afterwards generally felt that the Austrian and German sovereigns were at that time aware of the conspiracy which subsequently succeeded in kidnapping the Prince of Bulgaria, and had accordingly made arrangements for a concerted policy on the subject. Not only did the news seem to have come by surprise on the Courts of Vienna and Berlin, but it at once led to a divergence in the policy of the Austrian and German Cabinets, the former, supported by England, showing a decided leaning in favour of the Bulgarians, while Germany almost ostentatiously took the side of Russia. The question came up in the Hungarian Parliament on Sept. 30, when M. Tisza, the Premier, in reply to interpellations addressed to him by some of the members, denied the existence of any agreement between Austria and Russia on the subject of Bulgaria or of any other part of the Balkan Peninsula, repudiated all ideas of conquest on the part of the Vienna Cabinet, and declared that the maintenance of the Berlin Treaty sufficed for the interests of Austria. Austria desired the independent development of the Balkan States ; she was averse to any protectorate by an individual Power, and the only Power whose right to armed interference she would recognise was Turkey. At the meeting of the Austro-Hungarian delegations in November Count Kalnoky spoke to the same effect. He drew a broad distinction between the interests of Bulgaria and those of Europe, characterised the mission of General Kaulbars as being merely of a passing character, which would hardly leave lasting traces behind it, and declared that the policy of Austria must aim at the maintenance of the Berlin Treaty, and could not concern itself with the internal affairs of Bulgaria so long as that treaty remained intact. " Had Russia attempted to take advantage of the union between Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia to send a Commissioner to Bulgaria and seize the reins of government, and had taken steps for the occupation of the ports or the country generally, Austria would under such circumstances have arrived at a decision." The case had not, however, arisen, and Austria had done her utmost, by friendly representations to Russia, to prevent its arising. The Count next proceeded to make some interesting remarks as to the friends and supporters among the Powers of Austria's policy. As to Germany, she is only bound to protect the interests of Austria in so far as they coincide with her own. " The conf

ance of each country as a strong and independent Power for both an important interest." Count Kalnoky added that the relations of Austria towards the other Powers were also excellent and that "with the Russian Cabinet the most satisfactory understanding and friendly relations continue to be maintained." With England Austria's relations were "of special interest," and the views held in England on the Bulgarian question led him to hope that "England will also join us if necessary." He also laid stress on the circumstance that it was the interest of Italy, a Mediterranean Power, not to allow the balance of power in Eastern Europe to be disturbed. This very cautious and somewhat cold statement of policy created great dissatisfaction in Hungary, which feeling was in some degree reflected in the speech at the sitting of the committee of the Hungarian delegation on November 16. Count Andrassy, the late Foreign Minister, observed that the disturbed state of the East was caused by the "unnatural alliance" of the three Emperors which was formed at Skierniewice and renewed at Kremsier. Austria, he said, had not asserted herself for the protection of her interests because pressure had been brought to bear upon her by Germany, owing to the desire of the latter to conciliate Russia. So long as the alliance between Germany and Austria was not extended to Russia it worked well and safely; but from the moment when the two Empires, having common interests, were joined by a third whose aims were in notorious conflict with those of the other two, confusion and trouble arose. Referring to a remark made by Count Kalnoky, to the effect that Bulgaria should look to Russia to help her out of the present crisis, Count Andrassy further remarked that it was Russia that was the cause of the crisis, and that Russia can claim no special prerogative of interference in Bulgaria. To this Count Kalnoky assented, repeating that Austria took her stand on the Berlin Treaty; upon which Count Andrassy expressed his satisfaction at being able so far to conciliate Count Kalnoky's policy. Count Zichy and Count Apponyi also attacked the Foreign Minister, the former, an intimate friend of King Milan of Serbia, taking the opportunity of disclosing the terms of a secret treaty which, he said, had been concluded in June 1885 between Prince Nicholas of Montenegro and his son-in-law Prince Peter Karageorgievitch, to the effect that the latter renounced his claims to the throne of Serbia in favour of Prince Danilo, Prince Nicholas's eldest son, and was in return to obtain the throne of Bulgaria, "which was about to become vacant while Montenegro was to avail herself of the first opportunity of annexing Herzegovina and part of Albania. Ultimately, however, the Foreign Minister's policy was accepted by the Hungarian delegation as well as by the Austrian delegation. The policy, when cleared from the ambiguities employed by Count Kalnoky in his desire to conciliate both Russia and Hungary at the same time, was simply to avoid all interference in Bulgaria.



hairs so long as Russia did not send troops into Bulgaria. The questions of the election of a prince and of the degree to which Russia should exercise influence on the internal administration of the country were to be left to the Bulgarians and the Russian government to settle between themselves; Austria would only be called upon to "arrive at a decision" if Russia attempted to make herself mistress of the Government of Bulgaria by main force. That her decision would be in such a case was left in doubt. The Hungarian view was that such a step should be met by a declaration of war; but the policy of Austria at the time of the Russian invasion of Turkey in 1877-78 showed that the wishes of Hungary are not paramount in determining the action of the monarchy towards other Powers. The German element in the Empire, though indignant at the course of bullying pursued by General Kaulbars, was not inclined to contemplate the ventuality of Austria making war upon Russia without the assured support of Germany; and the Slavonic element, with the exception of the Poles, looked with dislike upon the prospect of a war with a nation of the same race as themselves. This division of opinion made the position of Austria at the close of the year very perilous one, for it added strength to the counsels of that powerful party at the Russian Court which looks upon Austria as the hereditary enemy of their country, and is continually representing to the Czar that he has only to come forward as the champion of Panslavism to win an easy triumph over an empire which is everywhere obstructing the policy of Russia in the East.

## CHAPTER III.

### EASTERN EUROPE.

#### I. RUSSIA.

DURING the spring there was an imperial progress in the southern districts of Russia. The Czar was received with the usual manifestations of official enthusiasm, accompanied by arrests of suspected Nihilists, and when he arrived at Sebastopol he issued a proclamation to the Black Sea fleet (May 19) which caused some commotion in the European capitals. In this proclamation the Czar, alluding to the reconstruction of the Black Sea fleet, stated that, although he had done his utmost "to promote the pacific development of the welfare of the Russian people," circumstances might compel him "to defend by force of arms the dignity of the Empire. You will," he concluded, "with me uphold it with devotion, and you will show the same firmness as that of which your fathers gave proof, in response to my grandfather's appeal, in a manner which gained the admiration of all their contemporaries. I call upon you in your turn to watch

over these waters, which have witnessed in past time Russian heroism, and to your care I confidently commit the honour and security of Russia." On arriving at Moscow on May 25, the Czar reviewed the troops, and then received the municipal functionaries, including the Mayor, who in his address remarked that the Czar had "restored life to the Black Sea," and thereby strengthened the belief and hope of Moscow "that the Cross of Christ will shine upon St. Sofia."

These warlike manifestations were followed by a declaration on the part of Russia, at the end of June, that it was her intention to terminate the arrangement embodied in the 59th article of the Treaty of Berlin constituting Batoum a free port. This declaration strikingly resembled the one made by Russia in 1870 with regard to the articles of the Treaty of Paris relating to the Black Sea; and Lord Rosebery, in two vigorous despatches protesting against this new disregard of treaties, quoted the protocol of the Black Sea Conference of January 17, 1871, recognising that "it is an essential principle of the law of nations that no Power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the contracting Powers by means of an amicable arrangement." None of the other Powers, however, made any objection to the Russian declaration, and M. de Giers, in a despatch dated July 10 (22), repelled, "with all the strength of his convictions," the charge that Russia had violated the faith of treaties, and adhered to the opinion "that the spontaneous declaration of the intention of the Emperor to make Batoum a free port did not constitute an obligation, and that consequently the modification of that intention, which circumstances require, could not be considered as a departure from engagements which did not exist." The despatch concluded with a hint that the Berlin Treaty had already been violated in the case of Bulgaria, in spite of the efforts of the Russian Government to maintain it, and an assurance "that the Imperial Cabinet are still anxious to contribute to the consolidation of the general peace, in the hope that the Powers which have fixed and guaranteed its bases will themselves respect them."

Some excitement was produced in August by the news that the British Cabinet had decided to recall the English members of the Afghan Boundary Commission. This was at first supposed to mean that serious differences had broken out between the English and the Russian Commissioners; but the true reason of the decision was that their work was nearly completed, and that the settlement of the short line of frontier which had not yet been traced by the commissioners turned upon a question which could only be decided by their respective Governments. The frontier was laid down and marked with pillars as far as Duktchi, forty miles from the Oxus, and it was the district intervening between *Duktchi* and that river as to which the commissioners were unable

to agree. By the terms of the protocol under which the commission was appointed, the frontier was to be drawn to Khoja Saleh, on the Oxus. It was found by the British Commissioners, however, that there was no place of that name, and that the appellation of Khoja Saleh, or Khwaja Salor, was given by the Afghans to a tract of country extending for a distance of twenty-five miles along the river from Kham-i-Ab. This district is fertile, and forms part of the governorship of Aktcha, which by the agreement of 1873 was declared to be a part of the dominions of Afghanistan, and has for nearly a century been under the Afghan rule. The Russian Commissioners claimed that the frontier should be drawn to the Eastern limit of the district, thereby removing the whole of it from Afghanistan, while the English Commissioners urged that the frontier should terminate at Kham-i-Ab, the western limit of the district. This question was not decided at the end of the year, but meanwhile Russia continued to strengthen her position in the vicinity of the Afghan frontier. The Transcaspian Railway was continued to Merv, the section between Askabad and that town having been opened on July 14, and a further prolongation of the line in the direction of the Amoo Darya was begun in the latter half of the year.

In Russia, as in the other countries of South-eastern Europe, the all-absorbing question of the year was that of Bulgaria. The attempts made to produce a reconciliation between the Czar and Prince Alexander had not only failed, but the measures taken by the Prince for consolidating the union of Bulgaria with Eastern Roumelia had greatly embittered the feeling against him at the Russian Court. These measures, singularly enough, were encouraged and approved by Gadban Effendi, the Turkish Envoy at Sofia, and the *rapprochement* between the Porte and Prince Alexander became so marked that Russia thought fit to make representations on the subject to the Sultan. On June 24 M. Onou, the Russian *Chargé d'Affaires* at Constantinople, called at the Turkish Foreign Office and stated that the Russian Government was in possession of proofs of the fact that Turkey had been working in Bulgaria in the interest of Prince Alexander, and had carried on intrigues with him and England in opposition to Russia. This had caused great dissatisfaction to the Russian Government, and it accordingly requested the Porte to ensure that the arrangements established by international treaty in her vassal State should be respected. Two days after a further communication was made to the Porte by M. Onou. He presented a note requiring the Porte immediately to pay the 200,000*l.* which Turkey had agreed some years back to grant as an indemnity to Russian subjects for their losses in the war of 1877, and intimating that Russia will hold the Porte responsible for any further transgressions on the part of Prince Alexander or of the Bulgarian Sobranje. The peremptory demand thus addressed to the Porte was followed by a significant article in the *Journal de St. Péters-*

*bourg*, pointing out that Prince Alexander had not only violated the Roumelian Organic Statute, but had set aside a European arrangement and totally disregarded the rights of the Sultan; that the indulgence shown by the Porte for these proceedings justified the suspicion of the existence of an understanding between the Porte and Prince Alexander; and that such a state of things could not fail to be "pregnant with serious dangers and perilous encouragements." These veiled Russian menaces thoroughly alarmed the Porte, and were the first steps to that Turco-Russian *rapprochement* which caused so much uneasiness to Germany, Austria, and England towards the end of the year. After the abdication of Prince Alexander, Gadban Effendi, who had been raised to the rank of Pasha, became one of the most zealous agents of Russian policy in Bulgaria.

When the seizure of the Prince became known, it was generally attributed to the Russian Government, and the suspicion was strengthened by the fact that Russian money was in the possession of the conspirators. It is more probable, however, that the act was the result of an excess of zeal on the part of Russian officials ambitious of promotion, and that the Russian Government was innocent of any participation in it. The *coup de main* was too clumsy and ill-contrived to have been the work of such skilful and experienced statesmen as the Czar's advisers, and the Czar himself would hardly have condescended to become the accomplice of cut-throats and kidnappers. But whether the Prince's capture had been instigated by the Russian Government or not, the general belief felt in Europe that it was Russia's work was equally humiliating to the Czar, and the humiliation became almost intolerable when the Bulgarians, Russia's *protégés*, for whom she had spent millions of money and lost thousands of her best soldiers, firmly resisted General Kaulbars's attempts to bully them into submission, and loudly proclaimed their attachment to Prince Alexander and their determination not to yield to Russian dictation. The impression at the Russian Court was that this stubborn attitude on the part of the men in power in Bulgaria was the result of the success of the Philippopolis revolution, which had placed Bulgaria in the hands of anarchists and political adventurers; and this afforded a further incitement to put an end to a state of things which was dangerous as well as humiliating to Russia. The mission of General Kaulbars having failed (though the Czar manifested his appreciation of his services by placing him on the staff of the Grand Duke Vladimir and decorating him), it became necessary to obtain allies among the European Powers with a view to putting such a pressure upon Germany and Austria as to leave Bulgaria practically isolated. It was with this object that Russia yielded to the overtures of France, ever eager to seize an opportunity which could bring her nearer to that war of revenge that has so long been the chief object of her aspirations. The newly cemented friendship between

two Powers was the more significant as the Czar had hitherto marked coldness to the French Republic, and the French mission at St. Petersburg had for some time been without a master; and Germany consequently became more unwilling ever to interfere in the Bulgarian imbroglio. The result of an understanding between Prince Bismarck and M. de Giers, which did not assume the proportions of a formal alliance, but which left Russia practically free to do what she wished in Bulgaria, as Austria could no longer hope for the support of Germany against Russian encroachment in that quarter, and the withdrawal of Lord Randolph Churchill from the Salisbury Cabinet largely dissipated the impression that any active step taken by Austria on behalf of the Bulgarians would be seconded by England. The Russian Government continued to proclaim by its words its desire for peace, but its acts were not in accordance with its professions. M. Katkoff, the editor of the *Moscow Gazette*, who had been decorated by the Czar, and whose influence at the Russian Court was so great that he was nicknamed the "co-Emperor," repeatedly advocated in his journal a policy of hostility against Austria; and the extensive concentration of Russian troops on the Austrian frontier, with other military preparations on a large scale, seemed to show that the Russian Government was disposed to adopt this policy.

## II. TURKEY AND THE MINOR STATES OF EASTERN EUROPE.

the disturbed condition into which Eastern Europe was thrown by the East Roumelian revolution and the Servo-Bulgarian war continued throughout the year. On Jan. 4 the Greek Government addressed a note to the Powers declaring that Greece keenly felt the loss of thousands of persons of the Greek nationality which would be involved in the union of Bulgaria with Eastern Roumelia, and demanding as compensation that the boundary between Turkey and Greece should be that originally fixed by the Berlin Congress. The Government at the same time announced to the Powers that it would, failing compliance with this demand, continue its naval and military preparations in order to be enabled to assert the rights of the Greek nation. The answer to this note was a proposal made to the Powers by Russia that Greece, Bulgaria, and Servia should be called upon at once to disarm (Jan. 7). The proposal was very favourably received, and on Jan. 11 collective notes to the above effect were presented by the representatives at Athens, Sofia, and Belgrade. The Porte immediately assured the Powers that it would disarm as soon as Bulgaria, and Greece did so. The Servian reply, dated Jan. 17, expressed regret that, "under existing circumstances in the Balkans," the Servian army could not be placed on a peace footing, as the peace negotiations with Bulgaria had not even commenced, and as there was "no guarantee for the simultaneous



loyal execution of the disarmament by all the States." The Greek Government replied on Jan. 18. It declined to disarm, on the ground that the Balkan question had not yet been satisfactorily solved, and that the negotiations on the subject had not been commenced. Bulgaria alone gave an affirmative reply to the collective note, but she made her assent conditional on the disarmament of Servia. Meanwhile, Servia called out her reserves and ordered new stores of artillery and other war material, and Greece purchased a hundred Whitehead torpedoes and posted 30,000 troops, with field guns and heavy ordnance, on the Turkish frontier. England now proposed (Jan. 18) that a collective note should be addressed to Greece by the Powers stating that a naval attack by Greece on Turkey would not be permitted. This note was delivered at Athens on Jan. 24. On the same day the Greek squadron, with torpedo launches, left Salamis Bay; and all the great Powers, except France, then decided, at the instigation of Lord Salisbury, to send ships of war to Suda Bay, in Crete, for the purpose of preventing Greece from landing troops on the Turkish coast or attacking Turkish vessels. On Feb. 2, Greece, in reply to the collective note of Jan. 24, represented that "any obstacle opposed to the free disposal of its naval forces" would be "incompatible with the independence of the State and the rights of the Crown, and at the same time prejudicial to the political interests of the country." Meanwhile Turkey, in a note addressed to the Powers on Jan. 27, laid stress on the sacrifices she had already made to appease the extravagant pretensions of Greece, and stated that the slightest further provocation from her would bring about a conflict. The combined fleet met at Suda Bay shortly after, but Greece still continued her warlike preparations.

The Powers now turned their attention to the position of Prince Alexander of Bulgaria with regard to Eastern Roumelia. After much pressure on the part of their ambassadors at Constantinople, and especially of Sir William White, the negotiations which had been proceeding since December between the Porte and M. Zanolff, the Bulgarian Foreign Minister, were concluded on Jan. 31, and the arrangement was sanctioned by an Imperial Iradé on Feb. 2. The following were the principal points of this arrangement:—

1. The Governor-Generalship of Eastern Roumelia to be entrusted to Prince Alexander of Bulgaria, on the basis of the Treaty of Berlin, for so long as his Highness "preserves a correct and faithful attitude" towards the Court of his Suzerain, and devotes his efforts to maintaining order and security in the province, and advancing the welfare of the Roumeliot population. The appointment to be confirmed by the Sultan by means of an Imperial firman, and renewed at the expiration of each period of five years fixed by Article XVII. of the above *Treaty*.

2. During the time that the administration of Eastern Roumelia and that of the principality of Bulgaria remain in the hands of the same person, the Imperial Government to administer directly, and separately from Eastern Roumelia, the Mussulman villages of the canton of Kirdjali, as well as the Mussulman villages which are situated in the neighbourhood of the Rhodope mountains, and have hitherto been excluded from that province, this being in lieu of the rights of the Imperial Government stipulated in the first paragraph of Article XV. of the Treaty of Berlin (providing for the establishment of Turkish garrisons on the frontier of Eastern Roumelia). The delimitation of this canton and the villages in question to be entrusted to a Technical Commission appointed by the Sublime Porte and Prince Alexander, and to be performed on the spot, taking into consideration the necessary strategic conditions, as demanded by the interests of the Imperial Government.

3. In case of any movement taking place in Bulgaria or Eastern Roumelia against the Imperial Government, the provisions of the first paragraph of the above-mentioned Article XV. to be put into force until the restoration of order. Should an act of foreign aggression take place against the principality of Bulgaria, or against Eastern Roumelia, which forms an integral part of the Empire, a sufficient number of Ottoman troops to be placed under the command of the Prince, and to act with the Bulgarian and Roumelian troops for the defence of those territories; if a similar attack is made against other Imperial provinces of European Turkey, the Prince to place at the service of the Sultan a sufficient number of Bulgarian troops, to act with the Imperial army, and be placed under the command-in-chief of the Ottoman generals.

4. A Commission appointed by the Sublime Porte and the Prince to examine the Organic Statute, and modify it according to the exigencies of the situation, and to local requirements and the interests of the Imperial Ottoman Treasury. This Commission to complete its labours within a period of four months. Until these modifications have received Imperial sanction to make them valid, the care of administering the province, according to the exigencies of present circumstances, to be entrusted to the wisdom and fidelity of the Prince.

This arrangement was objected to by Russia, and also by Prince Alexander of Bulgaria, although the Foreign Minister had accepted it. The Russian objection was chiefly based on the stipulations for mutual military assistance and the alteration of the Organic Statute, which M. de Giers held should be carried out by the Powers; while Prince Alexander objected to holding the Governor-Generalship of Eastern Roumelia for a specific term only. At length a compromise was arrived at, and on April 5 a protocol was signed by the representatives of the Powers at

Constantinople, accepting the arrangement with the following modifications:—

1. The Governor-Generalship of Eastern Roumelia to be entrusted to "the Prince of Bulgaria, in accordance with Article XVII. of the Treaty of Berlin."

2. The Organic Statute of Eastern Roumelia, when revised by the Turco-Bulgarian Technical Commission, to be submitted for the sanction of the Powers at a Conference to meet at Constantinople.

After much tedious negotiation, a treaty of peace between Servia and Bulgaria was signed at Bucharest on March 3. It consisted of a single article, simply declaring that from the date of the signature of the treaty "peace is restored between the kingdom of Servia and the principality of Bulgaria." The words "and friendly relations" followed the word "peace" in the original draft of the treaty, but they were struck out by the desire of Servia, who declared that the omission of the words was intended by her "as a protest against recent events in Eastern Roumelia." On March 4 and 5 decrees were issued ordering the demobilisation of the Servian and Bulgarian armies respectively. Greece, on the other hand, still obstinately resisted the pressure of the Powers, and on March 25 a royal decree was issued calling out the 1857 and 1858 reserves (amounting together to about 20,000 men). On April 5 the Powers informed the Greek Government of the arrangement which had been made with regard to Eastern Roumelia, and again urged the necessity of Greece adopting a pacific policy. A vote of want of confidence in the Government was at the same time proposed in the Greek Chamber by M. Tricoupis, the leader of the Opposition; but the tone of the debate was warlike, and it resulted in the rejection of the motion by a majority of 129 to 83. On April 12 Turkey again appealed to the Powers to induce Greece to disarm, and steps were taken, on the initiative of England, to address a peremptory demand to Greece with this object, and to support the demand by the presence of the allied squadron off the Piræus. On the day that the collective note was to be delivered, M. Delyannis assured the representatives of the Powers that he would, acting on the advice of France, "proceed to the gradual reduction of the effective force of the army in the period of time dictated by the prudence indispensable for such an operation"; but this assurance was not considered satisfactory. The allied squadron having arrived off the Piræus, a collective note, inviting the Greek Cabinet "to place its land and sea forces on a peace footing as promptly as possible, and to give the Powers the assurance in the course of a week from the date of the present declaration that orders have been promulgated to that effect," was delivered on April 26. A further collective note, asking for more definite explanations, was presented on May 6, and M. Delyannis having replied on the same day that he could only

refer the representatives of the Powers to his previous notes, they left Athens, by the orders of their respective Governments, on the following day. On May 10, in conformity with a proposal made by Lord Rosebery and accepted by the Powers, a declaration was issued to the effect that the Greek ports were blockaded by the allied fleet. The blockade extended from Cape Malea to Cape Colonna, and thence to the northern frontier of Greece, including the island of Eubœa; and also comprised the entrance of the gulf of Corinth on the western coast. Orders were given to the commanding officers of the fleet to detain every ship under the Greek flag which might attempt to come out from or enter into any of the ports or harbours, or communicate with any port of the coast within the above limits. Vessels containing cargo belonging to any subject or citizen of a Power other than Greece, or containing cargo shipped under a charter made before the notification of the blockade, were not to be detained. Immediately after this notification, M. Delyannis resigned, and the King sent for M. Tricoupis, who, however, declined to form a Cabinet. On May 12 a Cabinet of a non-political character was formed by M. Valvis, with M. Louriotis as Minister for Foreign Affairs, and General Petimezas—who is stated to have been the only officer in the Greek army who, when the question of war with Turkey first arose, had the courage to declare that the Greek forces were inadequate to the task—as Minister for War. The chief object of the formation of this Ministry, which was necessarily a transitional one, was to ascertain the feeling of the Greek Parliament on the question of war or disarmament; and the first step taken by M. Valvis was accordingly to convoke the Chamber. Parliament met on May 20, and chose M. Tricoupis as President of the Chamber by 139 votes to 78 given in favour of M. Delyannis. The consequence was the resignation of M. Valvis and the appointment of a new Ministry under M. Tricoupis (May 21). On the same day it was reported that a conflict had taken place between the Turkish and Greek troops on the frontier, and troops were ordered at Athens to start for the front. As usual in such cases, each side declared that the other had begun the attack, but the Turks appear to have had the advantage, and the Greek losses were stated to amount to nearly 300. On May 24 orders were given to the Greek troops to withdraw from the frontier, the Greek Government issued a decree for disarmament, and the Porte announced its intention to demobilise as soon as Greece should do so. The Greek army having been reduced to its peace strength, the blockade was raised on June 7; and on June 19 Parliament was prorogued, after M. Tricoupis had obtained its acceptance of a Reform Bill, reducing the number of its members from 245 to 150, prescribing that the electoral vote shall be taken by *departments* (equivalent to the *scrutin de liste*), and excluding military men from the Chamber. When the Greek Par-

liament reassembled in November, M. Tricoups, on introducing the Budget, represented that although considerable reduction had been made in various items of expenditure, it was absolutely necessary to impose some new taxes in order to prepare for the future, so as not again to be exposed to the humiliation which had been inflicted on the country in the spring. France and Italy did not hesitate to prepare in time of peace for fresh conflicts, and Greece should do likewise. The Opposition, however, furiously attacked the Government, declaring that the people were already taxed to their utmost capacity; and M. Tricoups finding that there was little chance of his carrying his Budget in Parliament as it was then constituted, dissolved the Chamber (Nov. 18), and issued a decree fixing the new elections for Jan. 16.

In Serbia, M. Garaschanin remained in office for some time after the signature of peace, notwithstanding the universal condemnation which was passed upon him in the country for the frivolous way in which he had rushed into the conflict with Bulgaria. He had himself described his policy by the words, "No allons piquer une tête," and the result of his plunge not only ruined his reputation as a statesman, but brought his country to the verge of destruction. The treasury was empty; 2,600,000 had been added to the public debt, and the people were impoverished by war contributions, requisitions, and all the indirect losses which war brings in its train, while the military prestige of Serbia had been compromised and the sympathies of Europe alienated. It is not surprising that under these circumstances none of the parties in the State were inclined to assume the reins of office; but the situation at length became so perilous that the King applied, though very unwillingly, to M. Ristic, the Liberal leader, to undertake the formation of a Cabinet (April 1). Ristic had long been identified with a philo-Russian policy, and his appointment was not therefore very satisfactory to Austria, though the tendency he and his party had shown to be on good terms with the other Balkan States, and their condemnation of the war with Bulgaria, indicated that his Cabinet would probably maintain a policy of peace. His policy was, however, not pacific for the King, who refused to sanction the large reductions he proposed in the war budget, and, finding M. Ristic immovable on this point, again summoned M. Garaschanin (April 4). The new Ministry was much of the same political colour as its predecessor, and M. Garaschanin, in the hope of obtaining a majority for his policy, dissolved the Skouptchina and ordered new elections (April 7). The result of the elections, which was known on May 9, was that 58 Ministerialists and 75 Opposition candidates were returned, so that the only way of obtaining a majority for the Government was the selection by the King, in virtue of the right conferred upon him by the Constitution, of 45 supporters of the Ministry. This, together with the dis-



sions which soon after broke out between the Liberal and Radical sections of the Opposition, enabled the Ministry to carry on the Government until the end of the year, notwithstanding the secret agitation carried on against King Milan by the pretender Karageorgievitch and his father-in-law, the Prince of Montenegro, who was stated to have brought cordial promises of support from the Czar on his return from St. Petersburg in the spring.

In Roumania, as in Bulgaria and Servia, there is a revolutionary party, said to be maintained by Russian gold, which agitates against the dynasty, and the attempt to assassinate M. Bratiano, the Roumanian Premier, on Sept. 16, was generally ascribed to this agency. The incident produced great indignation in the country, but had no other result, and the year in Roumania was on the whole an uneventful one. In Bulgaria, on the other hand, the arrangement sanctioned by the Protocol signed by the Powers at Constantinople on April 5 left the difficulties of the political situation as formidable as ever. Prince Alexander, having failed in his attempt to obtain the appointment of Governor-General of Eastern Roumelia for life instead of for a specific term only, used every effort to make the union between that province and Bulgaria a political and administrative as well as a personal one. He made a triumphal progress in his new dominions, proclaimed Bulgarian as the official language of Eastern Roumelia, and ordered that that province should be represented in the Bulgarian National Assembly at Sofia by 91 deputies. These measures created much dissatisfaction among the Greek and Turkish inhabitants of the province, who had already been induced to look unfavourably upon the new *régime* by Russian agents and the philo-Russian party in Bulgaria under M. Zankoff. On May 21 a conspiracy against the lives of Prince Alexander and M. Karaveloff, the Bulgarian Premier, was discovered at Bourgas; and serious disturbances occurred during the elections at the beginning of June. The result of the elections was, however, most favourable to the Government, only 118 out of the 300 members of the Assembly being avowedly hostile to it. The Assembly was opened by Prince Alexander on June 14, and in his speech from the throne he significantly declared that "the union of the two Bulgarias" had been "achieved," and that this was shown by the fact that the Bulgarian National Assembly had met "to deliberate and decide upon all questions affecting the interests of the united Fatherland." This declaration produced some excitement at Constantinople and other foreign capitals, but it naturally enhanced the popularity of Prince Alexander among the Bulgarians, though his personal enemies did not cease to use every means of undermining his power. Meanwhile no steps had been taken for the revision of the Organic Statute, as provided for by the *Constantinople Protocol*; and it was not until considerable pressure had been exercised by the Powers that the Ottoman and

Bulgarian delegates appointed for this purpose met at Sofia on Aug. 9. Their labours were speedily interrupted, however, by an event which at once absorbed the attention of Europe and thrust such minor matters as Organic Statutes into the background. On Aug. 22, after the greater part of the garrison of the capital had been moved to the frontier on the pretext of aggressive movements on the part of Servia, Prince Alexander was seized in his palace in the night by some Bulgarian officers, compelled to sign a document abdicating the throne, and driven by his captors to Widdin, whence they proceeded with him in a steam yacht on the Danube to Turn-Severin. On the following morning a meeting was held at which a resolution was passed praying the Czar to extend his sympathy to the Bulgarian people. A copy of this resolution was presented to the Russian Consul, and during the afternoon a Provisional Government which comprised several members of the Russian party (including its leader, M. Zankoff), was formed under the presidency of Mgr. Clement, Metropolitan of Tirnova. On the following day Mgr. Clement issued a proclamation to the Bulgarians, informing them of the Prince's abdication, on the ground that he was "convinced that his reign would be fatal to the Bulgarian nation," and of the formation of a Provisional Government; and assuring them that "the great Czar of Russia, the protector of Bulgaria," would not leave the country "without his powerful protection." In a subsequent proclamation the Provisional Government declared that, although Prince Alexander had "rendered great services to Bulgaria on the field of battle," in politics "he had too little regard for Bulgaria's position as a Slavonic State, and for the maintenance of good relations with Russia," his deposition, therefore, "had become a necessity." The authors of this proclamation, however, speedily had to stand aside in face of the protests which arrived from all parts of Bulgaria against the capture of the Prince. On August 23 M. Stambouloff, President of the Bulgarian Chamber, and an enthusiastic partisan of England, assumed the direction of the Provisional Government in the Prince's name at Tirnova, and appointed Colonel Moutkoureff, one of the heroes of Slivnitza, to be commander-in-chief of the army, with full civil and military powers. Mgr. Clement, M. Zankoff, Major Groueff, leader of the late revolution, and the other members of the Provisional Government at Sofia were at the same time arrested, and the former Ministry, under the presidency of M. Karaveloff, resumed the reins of office, though it was not recognised by the rival Government of M. Stambouloff at Tirnova. Meanwhile Prince Alexander, whose return was loudly called for among all classes of his subjects, including nearly the whole of the Bulgarian army, had arrived at Lemberg (Aug. 27), travelling through Russian territory from Reni Russi, on the Danube, where he was landed from his yacht. On the same day a Council of Regency

formed, consisting of MM. Stambouloff, Glaveskoff, and Nathevitzev, all adherents of the Prince; and on the following afternoon the Prince left Lemberg to return to Sofia by way of Bucharest. He was received with great enthusiasm at Rustchuk and other places on Bulgarian territory. On his arrival, M. Stambouloff and the other Regents appointed a new Cabinet, from which M. Karaveloff, on account of his Russian leanings, was excluded, and Prince Alexander issued a proclamation approving everything that had been done by the Regency, and expressing gratitude to the people and army, "who at a critical moment rose up and defended the honour, the independence, and the glorious name of Bulgaria," and had remained faithful to his throne. The Prince at the same time received a congratulatory telegram from his late adversary, King Milan of Servia, to which he responded in cordial terms.

It seemed as if Prince Alexander were now more firmly established on his throne than ever; but his nerves were shattered by the brutal treatment he had experienced at the hands of his captors, and, though the sympathies of all Europe were with him, he lacked the energy to defy the opposition of Russia. It was manifest that the midnight attack by which he was driven from his country, whether instigated by the Russian Government or not, could not have made the Czar more favourably disposed to him; and he accordingly sent, on Aug. 30, a telegram to the Czar in which he assured him, in language that may almost be described as cringing, of his "unalterable devotion" to the Czar's "august person," adding that Russia had given him his crown, and that he was "ready to return it into the hands of Russia's sovereign." To this the Czar haughtily replied that he could not approve Prince Alexander's return to Bulgaria, "foreseeing its sinister consequences for the country which has already been so sorely tried," and that the Prince must himself decide what course he would take. The Prince entered Sofia on Sept. 2, and immediately ordered the release of MM. Karaveloff and Zankoff, and suspended the proceedings against the rebel troops, who had unconditionally surrendered.

On Sept. 4, the Prince, who continued to be much depressed, and frequently shed tears on speaking to the persons with whom he was intimate, assembled the principal officers at his palace and announced to them his intention of resigning the throne, stating that he could not remain in Bulgaria, "as the Czar will not permit it." He then made a similar communication to MM. Stambouloff and Radoslavoff, who announced the Prince's intention to the Sobranje. A committee was chosen for the purpose of negotiating with Russia and the other Powers, and it addressed a request to the Czar through the Russian consuls for the name of the Russian candidate to the Bulgarian throne, for a promise *that there should not be a Russian occupation, for the maintenance of Bulgarian autonomy, and for the app*

ment of a Russian general, if desired, as Minister of War, reorganise the Bulgarian army with the help of Bulgarian officers. The Czar replied that he recognised the independence and union of Bulgaria, that a Russian occupation was out of the question, and that a Russian commissioner would be despatched to Bulgaria as soon as the Prince should have left the country. On Sept. 7 the Prince addressed a manifesto to the Bulgarian people, in which he stated that, being convinced that his departure would lead to the liberation of Bulgaria, and having been assured by the Czar that her independence and rights would remain intact, he had decided to renounce the Bulgarian throne, and had appointed as Regents MM. Stambouloff and Karaveloff and Colonel Moutkouroff. The same evening he left for Lom Palanka on his way to the residence of his family near Darmstadt, and was received with enthusiastic demonstration not only in all the Bulgarian towns through which he passed but along the whole of his route through Austria. Thus was the revenge of the Czar gratified, thanks to the timidity of the Prince and the Great Powers and the deficient political education of the Bulgarian people.

The next step was taken by the Porte, which addressed a circular note to the Powers on the day of the Prince's departure, pointing out that it was indispensable to put an end to the abnormal state of things in Bulgaria and Eastern Roumelia, and that it was of urgent importance that the Porte should be enabled to assure the Bulgarian Government in the name of the great Powers that no foreign intervention would take place in Bulgaria, and that the conditions guaranteed to her by treaty would be kept inviolate. In reply to this circular, only general assurances were given to the Porte that its treaty rights would be respected. The Sobranje met on Sept. 13, and two days after Major-General Kaulbars, Russian Military Attaché at Vienna, was appointed to the post of Russian Diplomatic Agent at Sofia. This officer was one of the Czar's most trusted servants, and he had, in the absence of Prince Lobanoff, of late been practically at the head of the Russian embassy at Vienna. Before he arrived, however, the Bulgarian Assembly passed an address (Sept. 16) denouncing the action of those who had taken part in the late conspiracy, and demanding the punishment of its authors; and the Russian agent at Sofia immediately threatened to break off all relations with the Bulgarian Government if proceedings should be taken to give effect to the decision of the Assembly on this point, and insisted on an official reply being given to his representations on the subject. The Government replied that there could be no question of punishing the conspirators at present, as they had not even been tried, and that it could not stop the course of justice.

When General Kaulbars arrived at Sofia (Sept. 25) he addressed to M. Natchevitz, the Bulgarian Minister of Foreign Affairs,

Affairs, the three following demands : (1) Immediate raising of the state of siege ; (2) liberation of all political prisoners, civil and military, " as the present Government, being a party government, cannot impartially judge another party " ; and (3) postponement of the elections to the Great Sobranje until public opinion had calmed down. A note embodying the first and second of these points was presented by General Kaulbars to the Government on Sept. 27, and on the following day the General issued a circular, which was distributed by the Russian consuls, giving an abstract of the speech delivered by him to the deputation of Zankoffists who met him on his arrival at Sofia, in which he made various complaints, chiefly of a trivial nature, against the Bulgarian Government and the National Assembly, and stated the three demands he had addressed to M. Natchevitz. The circular produced much indignation in the country, and, on Sept. 30, three representatives of every guild and corporation in Sofia went in a body to General Kaulbars to explain to him that the Russian demands were detrimental to the material and political interests of the country, and that the nation had complete confidence in the existing Government. On the same evening, M. Stambouloff made similar representations to the General on behalf of the Bulgarian Ministry ; and one of his demands, that of the raising of the state of siege, was at once conceded. He insisted, however, on immediate compliance with the two other demands, and replied to all remonstrances that he could not allow the Emperor's commands to be discussed. On Oct. 4, the Ministry replied in writing to the effect that they would endeavour to follow Russia's advice so far as might be compatible with the Constitution and the law of Bulgaria. This, however, did not satisfy the General, who not only called upon the Ministry to state within twenty-four hours whether the Government accepted or rejected his demands, but proceeded in full uniform to a public meeting at which the question of the day was being discussed, and attacked the Government in a violent speech, which was interrupted by loud cries of " Down with Russia ! " from the persons present, who were over two thousand in number. General Kaulbars followed up these extraordinary proceedings by starting on a tour through the country, " in order to study the situation and make himself thoroughly familiar with public opinion in the Principality."

In the provinces, as in the capital, he was very coldly received, and deputations met him demanding the punishment of the conspirators and the election of a new Prince. On Oct. 5 he repeated his outrageous conduct by ordering the officers of the garrison of Rustchuk, in the name of the Emperor of Russia, to set the political prisoners at liberty, holding them responsible for the consequences if they should disregard the Imperial mandate. The commandant, however, merely replied that he had no orders to receive except from the Minister for War at Sofia ; and w



quent attempts made by General Kaulbars to shake the fidelity of the garrisons at Schumla and Sistova met with a similar rebuff. A number of Russian agents, too, were arrested while endeavouring to form insurgent bands for the purpose of overthrowing the Bulgarian Government. Meanwhile preparations were made for the elections, and the Government sent a circular to all the foreign consuls requesting them to advise the subjects of their respective countries residing in Bulgaria not to interfere in the elections on pain of immediate expulsion. To this M. Nekliudoff, the Russian consul, replied that Russian subjects will be protected against all illegal attempts on the part of the Administration, and will as heretofore be kept within the strict limits of the law; adding that, pending the receipt of instructions from General Kaulbars, all exchange of written communication between the Russian agency and "those governing Bulgaria" was interrupted. The elections began on Oct. 10. Occasional riots took place between Russian partisans and the supporters of the Bulgarian Government, but on the whole the elections passed off without any serious disturbance, except at Dubnitsa, where two deputies and a prefect were murdered by Macedonians. The result of the polls was a complete triumph for the Government party, 489 of whose candidates were elected, while only 31 members of the new Chamber were Zankoffists. After the election M. Nekliudoff addressed three notes to the Government and the representatives of the Powers. In the first he conveyed "the strong censure passed by General Kaulbars" on a circular addressed by the Bulgarian Government to the Powers in which it appealed to them against the General's conduct; in the second he stated that the Russian Government declares the elections to be illegal, and therefore null and void; and, in the third, he protested against the "atrocities" committed by the Bulgarian gendarmerie on the peasants who had sided with the Russian party. Meanwhile, Gadban Effendi, who had been absent from Constantinople on leave, returned to Sofia, and immediately supported the Russian demands. General Kaulbars, on arriving in the capital from his provincial tour (Oct. 22), threatened extreme measures if the Government should attempt to punish any of the conspirators; and when the Ministers proceeded to Tirnova for the opening of the Sobranje, two Russian war-ships were sent to Varna, ostensibly to protect Russian subjects, but doubtless really to intimidate the Government and the National Assembly; and this effect was produced so far that the conspirators were at once liberated on bail, the Government at the same time addressing a note to the Powers protesting against the presence of Russian cruisers at Varna. This, however, only spurred General Kaulbars to fresh exertions. He despatched an ultimatum to the Government complaining of the treatment of Russian subjects in Bulgaria, and of the general system of terrorism employed by the Government, and threatening the

if in three days' time he did not receive a satisfactory answer he would leave Sofia with the whole consular *personnel*. The Sobranje, which consisted chiefly of peasants and tradesmen, the former numbering 137 and the latter 166, met on Oct. 31, and at once proceeded to take the preliminary steps for the election of a prince. Soon after news came of another Russian outrage. Captain Nabokoff, who had been concerned in the outbreak at Bourgas which preceded the kidnapping of Prince Alexander, attacked the public offices in that town at the head of a numerous band of Montenegrins, seized the prefect, and proclaimed Russian rule. The revolt was soon crushed by the troops, but it showed the persistence of Russian hostility to the Bulgarian Government; and that it had Russian official sanction was proved by the fact that directly General Kaulbars heard of it he telegraphed from Sofia that the Czar congratulated the Bulgarians and Montenegrins who had proclaimed a new Government in his Majesty's name. A similar plot was discovered at Philippopolis; but the author of it, a Russian, fled before he could be arrested by the authorities. The Sobranje in the meanwhile elected Prince Waldemar of Denmark, who declined to accept the election, and it now became evident that General Kaulbars's bullying mission had turned out a complete failure. A drunken cavass of the Russian consulate at Philippopolis having been arrested by a policeman for firing his revolver in the street, the General took the opportunity of presenting another ultimatum to the Government, demanding the dismissal of the prefect and the officer commanding the district; and, not having received any reply, he left with all the Russian consuls for St. Petersburg (Nov. 20). The climax of this scandalous farce was worthy of the rest of the performance: the drunken cavass who had served as the pretext for General Kaulbars's departure received the Order of St. George from the Czar.

After General Kaulbars's departure there was a lull in the Bulgarian question, which continued until the end of the year. A new candidate for the Bulgarian throne—Prince Nicolas of Mingrelia—was semi-officially put forward by Russia; the candidature was supported by the Porte, but was rejected by the Bulgarian Government on the ground that the prince, whose father, a Circassian, had sold his crown and country to Russia, did not occupy a sufficiently independent position, and was unacceptable to all parties in the country. A deputation from the Bulgarian Government proceeded early in December to the principal European capitals, and at Vienna they proposed to Prince Ferdinand of Coburg that he should become a candidate for the vacant throne. The negotiations on this subject, however, and the attempts of the delegates to obtain the active support of the Great Powers, remained without result; abundant sympathy was expressed, but all the Foreign Ministers whom they visited assured them that their best course would be to come to

standing with Russia. The Russian Government, on the other hand, refused to come to an understanding on any other conditions than that the Regents and the Ministry should resign, new Sobranje be elected, and a Coalition Ministry appointed comprising a certain number of members of the Zankoffist or Russian party.

One bright point in the general gloom which covered the prospects of Bulgaria at the end of the year was the reconciliation with Servia. After King Milan's friendly telegram to Prince Alexander on the latter's return to Sofia after his capture, relations of a very friendly character were opened between the Servian and Bulgarian Governments. Dr. Stransky, the author of the Philippopolis revolution in 1885 (ANNUAL REGISTER, 1886, p. 269), was despatched to Belgrade on Oct. 8 to negotiate on the questions at issue between the two Governments, and on Oct. 27 a "protocol of agreement" was concluded, under which the question of the possession of Bregovo was to be referred to a joint Servo-Bulgarian commission; the Servian emigrants to Bulgaria were to be removed to a distance of sixty kilometres from the Servian frontier; the railway lines between Makare and Tsaribrod, and between Nish and Pirot, were to be constructed as soon as possible; and a treaty of commerce was to be signed by the representatives of Servia and Bulgaria within six months. On Dec. 5 a Servian diplomatic agent, M. Danitch, took up his residence at Sofia, and was received with great ceremony by the Regents.

The diplomatic action of the Porte in the Bulgarian imbroglio reflected the vacillating character of the Sultan. At first inclined to oppose Russia, Turkey soon yielded to the bullying policy which had totally failed with her vassal Bulgaria; and although at the end of the year, thanks to the energy and firmness of Sir William White, the British Ambassador, the Sultan seemed inclined to yield to the remonstrances of England and Austria, and Gadda Pasha, the Turkish Kaulbars, had been recalled from Sofia, the Turkish Government continued to act as the mouthpiece of Russia in its communications with the Bulgarian Government.

## CHAPTER IV.

### MINOR STATES OF EUROPE.

I. BELGIUM. II. THE NETHERLANDS. III. SWITZERLAND. IV. SPAIN.  
V. PORTUGAL. VI. DENMARK. VII. NORWAY. VIII. SWEDEN.

#### I. BELGIUM.

BELGIUM, during the year, was on more than one occasion the scene of that uprising of the unemployed which marked the history of so many countries. Towards the end of March,

Socialist manifestation, intended to celebrate the anniversary of the Paris Commune, was made at Liège. A number of persons, belonging almost entirely to the working classes, marched through the streets of the town, preceded by red flags, amidst cries of "Down with Capital! Death to the middle classes!" Most of the men were provided with thick sticks, and at a given signal began plundering and wrecking the shops on their line of route. So unexpected had been this attack that for over half an hour the mob was completely master of certain parts of the town. The united forces of the gendarmerie police and civic guard succeeded, however, in restoring order without bloodshed.

This outburst was unfortunately but the beginning of far more serious riots, of which the first took place in the neighbourhood of Liège. Strikes broke out almost simultaneously throughout the whole of the densely populated mining districts of the valley of the Meuse, and armed bands of several hundred men destroyed and pillaged private and public buildings, forcing the inhabitants to give up large sums of money, and making frequent use of their firearms. The situation at length became so serious that the local forces were wholly unable to maintain order, and the help of the regular troops was found requisite. Several regiments of infantry and two of cavalry were despatched to the disturbed districts, and it was not without bloodshed on both sides that order was restored. Meanwhile, the irritation of the working classes increased and rapidly spread over the whole of the industrial parts of the province. Strikes were continually breaking out, accompanied in most instances by fresh attempts against life and property, so that it was found expedient to retain an imposing military force in all the populous disaffected districts, while volunteers maintained order elsewhere.

Before the disorders in the Liège district had been altogether allayed, strikes, accompanied with still greater acts of violence, broke out in the industrious province of Hainault. Here the rioters, who were connected either with the coalpit or glass industries, assembled in well-armed bands, under the guidance of noted Anarchists, and, after completely destroying all the machinery and instruments upon which they could lay hands, they set fire to several important glass manufactories and private buildings, destroying property to the amount of over 20 millions of francs. An imposing military force, under the command of General Vander Smissen, was despatched, but too late, unfortunately, to prevent the worst excesses. The task of restoring order, too, was far from being easy, and several collisions between the troops and rioters took place, costing the lives of over seventy of the latter before calm was restored.

Such displays of ill-will against the upper classes had been hitherto unknown in Belgium, where the strikes, although of frequent occurrence, had always ended peaceably. The causes of this change of feeling were numerous. The industrial crisis

lays as heavily on Belgium as on other countries; wages are very low and misery very great among the working classes. But these causes alone would not suffice to account for the events of the year: these had, in a great measure, a Socialist origin. All the bands that overran the country were conducted by men avowedly known as Socialist leaders. Numerous foreign Anarchists, mostly German, were also at the head of the movement, exciting the minds of the rioters and openly asserting their right to pillage. Certain Belgian Socialist newspapers also encouraged the revolt to such an extent that their editors were condemned to imprisonment for inciting the working classes to the violation of the law. In short, the whole affair was conducted in strict accordance to the Socialist theories, which were readily accepted by populations whose misery was but too real.

A fresh proof of this appeared, shortly after the restoration of order, in the proposal of a Socialist manifestation at Brussels for June 13, in order to protest against the measures which had been taken against the strikes. The manifestation was, however, forbidden by the burgomaster of Brussels, M. Buisson, who judged with reason that the recent events were still too fresh in the memory of the workmen to allow 100,000 of them to assemble without danger to public security. Two months later, however, when their minds were less excited, a manifestation of the kind was allowed at Brussels, and passed off in the greatest order, amidst almost general indifference.

As soon as the riots were completely repressed, the Government undertook, by means of a commission, to make inquiry into the condition of the labouring classes throughout the kingdom, to take cognisance of the complaints of the workmen, and to propose measures of relief. This inquiry was conducted by the most noteworthy industrial and political men: it revealed, as one of the great causes of pauperism in Belgium, the continuous progress of alcoholism in the lower classes. Several very just claims of the workmen were taken into serious consideration, but up to the close of the year no practical measures of any kind resulted from the report of the commissioners.

These serious events which occupied public opinion in no way put a stop to the dissensions between the Liberal and Catholic parties. The misunderstanding, indeed, between the moderate Liberals and the Radicals increased. The provincial elections in May did not greatly change the respective situation of the two parties in the provincial councils, although the Liberals had rather the advantage, and the latter had great hopes that the legislative elections of June might prove favourable to their cause. In this, however, they were greatly deceived, for they lost several seats of which they had felt quite sure, the result being that the Catholic majority in the Chamber of Representatives was raised from 34 to 56, and was increased in the same proportion in the Senate. Subsequent partial elections, caused



ther by deaths or resignations (the latter including that of M. undersmissen, the Catholic leader at Brussels, charged with the murder of his wife), slightly diminished this crushing majority, far the largest any party ever had in this country.

Such a decided predominance of one party over the other had never before been seen in Belgium, and was the more remarkable inasmuch as the upper classes were not in general favourable to the clerical policy, especially on the question of public instruction. But the Belgian Catholics correspond to the Conservatives in other countries, and a great number of Liberals, alarmed at the theories of the Radicals, preferred voting for a clerical candidate to allowing the seat to fall to a Radical. The latter, moreover, had of late changed their tactics, and from being simply democratic as formerly have almost completely turned towards socialism. The two fractions of the Liberal party, if reunited, might soon overthrow the Catholic Government, and at one moment it was thought this union was about to take place. The attempt at reconciliation arose out of the arbitrary dismissal by the Government of a civil magistrate (*échevin*) at Namur, who in his political discourse had attacked with the utmost vehemence the Catholic policy in educational matters. The reconciliation, however, was but of short duration, the Radicals having imposed as a condition *sine quâ non* to their uniting with the rest of the Liberal party that the latter should adopt their views in regard to the revision of the Constitution. But the immense majority of the Liberal party is completely opposed to this revision, which is considered as most dangerous for the country's highest interests, and so the negotiations were brought to a close.

Another question which occupied public attention was the necessity for Belgium to be able to defend her neutrality in case of war. For some years the need of increasing the army, or at least creating a reserve force, amounting to 30,000 men, has been vigorously advocated; but the Minister of War, General Pontus, who supported this measure, has hitherto not been able to present a project of law to that effect, on account of the great hostility any increase of the military charges meets with in the Catholic party.

On the other hand, the intervention of the army during the riots drew public attention to consider the necessity of changing some points in the system of recruiting the military forces. The Belgian army is recruited by conscription, but all who can afford to pay to a substitute the sum fixed by the law can escape military service altogether. The consequence is that the army is almost exclusively composed of men belonging to the working classes; and the danger of confiding the task of repressing future riots to an army exclusively composed of proletarians was brought home to many. During the repression of the strikes, the Socialist papers had openly urged the soldiers not to fight against their brothers, but rather to help them in their struggle against the bosses and capital. In spite of the care taken to prevent the

Socialist theories from pervading the barracks, and the strict orders prohibiting soldiers attending public meetings, Socialist principles are gaining ground in the army. This danger can but increase in the future, seeing that Socialist doctrines in many cases are taught to the young men before they enter the army. The remedy proposed for this most serious danger was to induce a greater fusion of both rich and poor; in other words, to establish personal military service and to suppress the faculty of eluding military duties by the payment of a certain sum of money. Hitherto the poorer classes alone have borne the entire weight of assuring public security, and this injustice has been keenly felt by them. A great deal of the bitter feelings of the poorer against the richer classes, it was argued, would subside if this heavy charge were more equitably distributed. A project of law was therefore proposed by a distinguished member of the Catholic party, intended to redress this abuse, and met with the warmest approbation of the whole of the Liberal party. The Government also readily expressed its desire to adopt the project. Unfortunately, a large number of Catholics, moved by political interest or electoral considerations, opposed it with the utmost violence. Amongst its most determined adversaries were M. Woeste and M. Jacobs, the two Catholic Ministers whom the King dismissed two years ago on account of the dissatisfaction they had caused throughout the country by their intolerable views on the question of public instruction.

A law of less general interest, though of great importance was passed during the course of last session, destined to render less easy the access to the Universities, where hitherto any one had a right to enter. Henceforth it will be necessary either to produce a certificate of complete college studies, or to pass an examination on the various points fixed by the law.

## II. THE NETHERLANDS.

LIKE several other countries, Holland has had this year to deal with serious social questions, which, by the situation they disclosed even more than by the gravity of the events that took place, diverted public attention from purely political topics. Amsterdam was the principal theatre of the disorders which broke out on the occasion of a Socialist manifestation. Upward of 5,000 persons had assembled at an open-air meeting, at which the principal orators of the Socialist party, amongst others Danela Nieuvenhuys, made speeches, bitterly upbraiding the Government for its inaction in face of the misery of the working classes. The assembly then unanimously voted the following resolutions: (1) The Government should undertake important works of public utility; (2) should build under sanitary conditions the houses actually occupied by the working classes; (3) should limit the day's work to ten hours, and fix

a *minimum* day's pay at 40 centimes; and, finally, should establish an income tax, and should provide food for labourers momentarily without work. After this vote, instead of separating peaceably, the meeting assumed such a threatening attitude that the intervention of the police became necessary, and in the disturbances which ensued several persons lost their lives. Hardly were men's minds calmed down when, three weeks later, the interdiction of a favourite game of the lower classes, "eel-catching," on the ground of its cruelty, brought about still more serious disorders. The whole police force of Amsterdam being found unable to maintain order, the intervention of the troops was required; and 400 infantry, 150 artillery, and a squadron of cavalry appeared upon the scene. After three legal summons to disperse, the troops made use of their arms, and charged the crowd, killing twenty-five men and wounding and maiming ninety more. That these riots had been prepared beforehand, and did not break out spontaneously on account of the interdiction of a cruel but popular sport, seems beyond doubt, for numerous red and black flags and banners were visible in the crowd, and the general opinion was that Anarchists were in a great measure the authors of the events in Amsterdam.

This conviction, coupled with the fact that several well-known Socialists had for some time previous 'been exciting the minds of the working classes by violent discourses, decided the Government to modify the existing laws on the right of public meeting, and to declare that any public manifestation or assembly in the open air without the assent of the local authorities was strictly forbidden. Such authorisation would only be granted under certain conditions, and especially reserved to the authorities the right of forbidding the use of banners and emblems on such occasions. The Minister of the Interior was further empowered, if circumstances rendered such a measure necessary, to prevent for any length of time all public meetings in any defined districts. The slightest incitement to overt acts, or to disobedience to the existing laws, even whether expressed in direct or general terms, gave the authorities the right of dissolving public meetings.

Apart from these social questions, the beginning of the year was marked by a Ministerial crisis, brought on by the refusal of the Second Chamber to accept certain proposals of the Government respecting a revision of the Constitution, especially on educational affairs. Upon an adverse vote, the Prime Minister, M. Heemskirk, resigned, as did all his colleagues, offering at the same time to remain in office till a new Ministry should be formed. None, however, of the party leaders were disposed to accept this task, so that the Heemskirk Ministry remained in power, but dissolved the Second Chamber. The elections that took place shortly afterwards proved highly favourable to the Liberals, who were before in a minority, the new Chamber being composed of 47 Liberals and 89 Conservatives.

Socialist theories from pervading the barracks. Heem's orders prohibiting soldiers attending public meetings of political principles are gaining ground in the army. There is more in accordance in the future, seeing that Socialism is increasing. His first cases are taught to the young men before a Bill for modification of the remedy proposed for this most serious defect to electoral rights. A greater fusion of both rich and poor is the absolute excuse for personal military service and for the discharge and the withdrawal of military duties by the payment of a sum. Hitherto the poorer classes alone were not possessed of a certain point of the project was assuring public security, and the actual capacity to the form by them. A great deal of the Government further proposed a tax on the richer classes, it was a electoral law, in view of an immediate charge were more equitable, and an increase in the number of members of the Chamber to 100 and of the First Chamber to 100, intended to receive the approval of the Chambers, which were only proposed towards the end of the year, and were not discussed by the Chambers until after the holidays. At last, a large settlement of the colonial difficulties or electoral law was again postponed, and at Achéne. Amongst the Dutch authority, accompanied by pillage and robbery, were continually taking place. At the time of the colonial budget, which disclosed a deficit of 1,000,000 florins, the Minister of Colonies insisted on the necessity of putting a speedy end to these depredations. As the first thing to be done, to inspire the inhabitants with terror by a vigorous campaign, and the activity of the Government set about enlisting soldiers for the colonial army showed that this course had been decided upon. There was, moreover, talk of re-establishing a sultan at Achéne. The last sultan had died shortly after the beginning of the war with Holland, and the native chiefs had refused to accept his successor. The legitimate heir of the deceased sovereign, Tsankou-Daud, has just attained his majority, and seems to have great chances to be accepted as sultan by his faithful subjects; whilst it is believed that his readiness to accept the suzerainty of Holland, in exchange for certain advantages, will facilitate his election.

### III. SWITZERLAND.

THE most interesting event of the year was the adoption of the new laws against alcoholism. In order to repress drunkenness under its most dangerous form of spirit-drinking, the Federal Council proposed, towards the close of 1885, to bring forward a new law with regard to the fabrication, price, and sale of alcohol. To accomplish this, however, it was necessary to revise Art. 81 of the Constitution, recognising the right

Freedom of commerce and industry throughout the Swiss Confederation. This revision, on an appeal was granted by a majority of over 72,000 votes. Being thus adopted, the required measures had to be submitted to the Federal Council. Before submitting any proposition to the Council, desirous of obtaining the advice of the Council, the Government referred the question to a commission for deliberations. Several resolutions were proposed, each of which had to be weighed against its drawbacks. The choice of the Council was rendered all the more difficult by the fact that no resolution was adopted, it would become necessary to impose taxes on foreign spirits. After a prolonged discussion on the question, the Council adopted a project by which the State would have the monopoly, not only of the importation, but also of the retail sale of spirituous liquors, which was ratified by the Federal Chamber, by 102 against 6 votes, ratified this decision. The question, however, may still be rejected by the people at large if a plebiscite be demanded.

The Swiss Government resumed negotiations with Germany on the occasion of the renewal of the commercial treaties between the two countries. Switzerland, by former conventions, had undertaken to put only moderate taxes on German products; but Germany, on the other hand, taking advantage of the liberty allowed her under the treaty, had heavily taxed Swiss goods. The consequence was, that the Swiss export trade to Germany diminished yearly, and frequently German goods were sold cheaper on Swiss territory than similar products of home manufacture. Such a state of things could not last, and the Federal Council, making use of its right to denounce commercial treaties, requested the German Government to modify the convention of 1881. To this proposal Germany consented, but it was feared that she would not make sufficient concessions, in which case Switzerland would have to abandon her free-trade principles and adopt a protectionist system.

Mgr. Lachat, who three years previously as Bishop of Basle had, in consequence of misunderstandings with his diocese, been transferred to the canton of Tessin, again aroused great opposition by the reforms he sought to introduce. From all time, the privilege of choosing their priests had been vested in the inhabitants. Of this the new bishop tried to deprive them, claiming for himself the sole right of election. With this object, he commenced negotiations with the cantonal government, from which, the majority being Catholics, he obtained the concession he desired. The Federal Council, however, refused to ratify this decision. Beaten on this point, Mgr. Lachat thereupon decided upon modifying and renewing the cantonal organisation of the Church; and here the local government being supreme in this matter, hastened to comply with the bishop's wishes. The canton of Tessin was thereupon divided into new

*Veterinary.—Swiss. P. 112.  
at 40 centimes; and finally, should  
should provide for the  
this rate, instead of 10 centimes.  
Liberalism, should  
and in the  
1878.*



In spite of this altered state of things, M. Heen although representing a previously balanced condition of mind, decided not to resign office, but to adopt a policy more in accordance with the ideas of the new Liberal majority. His first business under these new circumstances, was to present a Bill for amending the article of the Constitution relating to electoral law. The most important features of the Bill were the absolute abolition of the principle of universal suffrage and the withdrawal of the right to vote from all who were not possessed of a certain amount of instruction. The main point of the project was therefore, the addition of intellectual capacity to the fiscal qualification. The Government further proposed a temporary modification of the electoral law, in view of an immediate extension of the franchise, and an increase in the number of members of the Second Chamber to 100 and of the First Chamber to 50. These measures, which were only proposed towards the close of the year, were not discussed by the Chambers until the Christmas holidays.

The long-deferred settlement of the colonial difficulties of the country was again postponed, and at Ache especially the situation was still far from satisfactory. Rebellions against the Dutch authority, accompanied by pillage and murder, were continually taking place. At the time of the discussion of the colonial budget, which disclosed a deficit of 15,000,000 florins, the Minister of Colonies insisted on the necessity of putting a speedy end to these depredations. He proposed, as the first thing to be done, to inspire the inhabitants with terror by a vigorous campaign, and the activity which the Government set about enlisting soldiers for the colonial army showed that this course had been decided on. There was, moreover, talk of re-establishing a sultan at Ache. The last sultan had died shortly after the beginning of the war with Holland, and the native chiefs had refused to elect his successor. The legitimate heir of the deceased sultan, Tuankou-Daud, has just attained his majority, and seems to have great chances to be accepted as sultan by his subjects; whilst it is believed that his readiness to accept the suzerainty of Holland, in exchange for certain advantages, will facilitate his election.

### III. SWITZERLAND.

THE most interesting event of the year was the adoption of the new laws against alcoholism. In order to repress drunkenness under its most dangerous form of spirit-drinking, the Federal Council proposed, towards the close of 1885, to bring forward a new law with regard to the fabrication, price, and sale of alcohol. To accomplish this, however, it was necessary to revise Art. 31 of the Constitution, recognising the right

complete freedom of commerce and industry throughout the whole of the Swiss Confederation. This revision, on an appeal to the people, was granted by a majority of over 72,000 votes. The principle being thus adopted, the required measures had next to be taken. Before submitting any proposition to the Bund, the Federal Council, desirous of obtaining the advice of competent persons, referred the question to a commission for report. Three principal solutions were proposed, each of which had its advantages but also its drawbacks. The choice of the Federal Council was rendered all the more difficult by the fact that, whatever solution was adopted, it would become necessary to increase the taxes on foreign spirits. After a prolonged examination of the question, the Council adopted a project by which the State would have the monopoly, not only of the fabrication, but also of the retail sale of spirituous liquors, and the Federal Chamber, by 102 against 6 votes, ratified this decision. The question, however, may still be rejected by the people at large if a plebiscite be demanded.

The Swiss Government resumed negotiations with Germany on the occasion of the renewal of the commercial treaties between the two countries. Switzerland, by former conventions, had undertaken to put only moderate taxes on German products; but Germany, on the other hand, taking advantage of the liberty allowed her under the treaty, had heavily taxed Swiss goods. The consequence was, that the Swiss export trade to Germany diminished yearly, and frequently German goods were sold cheaper on Swiss territory than similar products of home manufacture. Such a state of things could not last, and the Federal Council, making use of its right to denounce commercial treaties, requested the German Government to modify the convention of 1881. To this proposal Germany consented, but it was feared that she would not make sufficient concessions, in which case Switzerland would have to abandon her free-trade principles and adopt a protectionist system.

Mgr. Lachat, who three years previously as Bishop of Basle had, in consequence of misunderstandings with his diocese, been transferred to the canton of Tessin, again aroused great opposition by the reforms he sought to introduce. From all time, the privilege of choosing their priests had been vested in the inhabitants. Of this the new bishop tried to deprive them, claiming for himself the sole right of election. With this object, he commenced negotiations with the cantonal government, from which, the majority being Catholics, he obtained the concession he desired. The Federal Council, however, refused to ratify this decision. Beaten on this point, Mgr. Lachat thereupon decided upon modifying and renewing the cantonal organisation of the Church; and here the local government being supreme in this matter, hastened to comply with the bishop's wishes. *The canton of Tessin was thereupon divided into new*

parishes, and the management of the ecclesiastical property taken out of the hands of the communal councils and over, without control, to the priests. As might be supposed, these proceedings greatly irritated the Liberals, who upon bringing the question before the Federal Council took further action.

Elections for the renewal of the cantonal council took place this year in the canton of Geneva. The grand council of which the powers had come to an end, was composed of one Radical and forty-nine moderate Liberals. After the election, the respective position of both parties remained unchanged, in spite of the hopes entertained by the Liberals of overthrowing their adversaries. Nor were these hopes groundless: two months before the polling, the people of Geneva had been consulted upon a question which for several years had divided the Radicals and the Liberals. Hitherto, when an election took place, the electors were obliged to vote in the town of the canton, and the Liberals decided to effect a change under which the electors should be allowed to vote in the special communes. This proposal was violently opposed by the Radicals, but was nevertheless adopted by a majority of 12,800 voters. It was also decided at the same time by popular vote that the new regulation should be applicable only to the local elections, but also to those for the cantonal council. On this latter point the majority was small, amounting only to 878. Nevertheless it was a severe blow to the Radicals who had hoped that, even if the project were adopted, they could create an exception for the cantonal council. The hopes built by the moderate Liberals on these victories were, however, delayed by the results of the Geneva elections.

In the canton of Zurich a new law was promulgated which will further extend the age and limits of primary education. Under this law every child of six years of age must attend a primary school, and remain there for a period of six years. At twelve the pupils will have to choose between the technical and the secondary schools, according to their abilities and their intended future career. From the age of fifteen till seventeen school attendance will cease to be obligatory for young men, although they may continue their education in special schools to be established by the communes under control of the cantonal council. But at seventeen every young man will be obliged to attend the *civilschule* for two months, at the rate of forty francs per month, to learn history, geography, political economy, and the principles upon which the national and cantonal government is conducted. In all these schools the number of hours are fixed by the law, and will be adapted to the different ages of the children. They are strictly lay schools, and no teacher is to be allowed to have more than twenty-four pupils. The costs of carrying out this law are estimated

exceed those of the old system by more than 210,000 francs per annum.

Quite at the close of the year an important military law for establishing a landsturm was unanimously voted by the Federal Chamber, by which the army, in case of war, might be increased by about 100,000 well-drilled soldiers.

The Federal Assembly elected M. Droz, a Radical, and M. Hertenstein, a moderate Liberal, respectively as President and Vice-President of the Swiss Confederation for the coming year.

#### IV. SPAIN.

Señor Camacho's financial Bills having passed the Congress after little or no debate (Jan. 2), a stirring one arose on the debate on the succession to the throne, during which the split in the Conservative party (ANN. REG., 1885, p. 298) assumed a definitive aspect. Señor Muro, Republican, disputing the legality of the Queen-Regent's oath, moved a censure on the late Cabinet. Señor Cánovas replied that Isabel II.'s abdication had been made in legal form, and had been the basis of the political status ever since. At the next sitting, speaking on the motion, Señor Romero Robledo, leader of the Conservative dissidents, animadverted on Cánovas's resignation, and declared himself and adherents the only true element of the Conservative party. After a reply from Señor Silvela in defence of the Cánovists, the Premier, Señor Sagasta, explained why he had accepted power, regretted the division of the Conservative ranks, and promised to fulfil the Liberal programme as soon as the state of parties permitted. The Cortes were abruptly closed by royal decree (Jan. 5), in order, it would appear, to prevent matters growing worse, and the possibility of international questions (chiefly the Caroline Islands protocol, entailing arrangements still pending with Germany) being involved in the debate. But the disrapture of the Conservatives was complete: they formed now two groups, the Conservadores-Historicos (Cánovists) and the Conservadores-Liberales (Romerists), the latter rather a misnomer under the circumstances.

Señor Romero Robledo now set about to organise his party in the provinces and the press, whilst the Republicans were bent on a coalition of the groups under Ruiz Zorrilla, Salmeron, Pi y Margall, and Castelar, with a view to strengthen their united action at the next elections, in which Don Carlos's representative dissuaded the Carlists from taking part, while authorising some candidates to go forth on their own account. At the same time, the Dynastic Left, whose military leader, General Lopez Dominguez (Señor Becerra being their civil leader), had refused the Paris embassy because his condition to return to Madrid when party purposes rendered his presence necessary was not acceded to, resolved on maintaining an attitude of benevolent neutrality

towards the Government, provided they did not unduly postpone the realisation of their promises.

The first step taken by the Ministry which met with general approval was the decree (Feb. 5), countersigned by Señor Montero Ríoz, annulling the retrograde measures of Señor Pidal respecting public instruction arising out of the University manifestations (*see* ANNUAL REGISTER, 1884, p. 329). The clergy and reactionaries tried their utmost to stop the decree; but it was nevertheless submitted to the Queen-Regent, who signed it without hesitation, thereby enhancing her reputation of statesman-like qualities among Liberals and the unprejudiced.

A coalition of the Romerists and the Dynastic Left having been mooted about this time, for combined effort at the approaching elections, the plan was finally settled by the end of the month. At a meeting (March 26) the hope was expressed that the two parties might ultimately coalesce for good. General Lopez Dominguez was forced to absent himself from this and other meetings, in consequence of an order of the Minister of War suppressing the political rights of senators and deputies belonging to the army, outside their parliamentary acts. The alliance of Republican, or rather Radical, groups was also effected on the following basis: Universal suffrage; efforts to bring about the republic; the constitution of 1869, with municipal law of 1870 in a republican form; convocation of the Constituent Cortes, with free elections; and the acceptance of the Constitution to be framed by that body. On the establishment of the republic each group was to be free as to reforms to be promoted; the principal aim of coalition was to set up the republic as a national, not a party, work. This agreement was signed by Pi y Margall, Salmeron, the Democratic Progressists (Zorrillists), and the Federals, and published (March 20). Señor Castelar, however, refused to join the group. He would have nothing to do with partisans he had bombarded at Carthagená when President of the Republic. He did not want a republic *with* Radicals, but *against* Radicalism, as stated in his newspapers. With the exception of a few localities (Tarragona, Gerona, Belchite, Segorbe, Irun, Logrono, etc.), the Possibilistas supported their leader's policy.

The results of the election for Deputies (April 4) showed 810 Fusionists or Ministerialists (*i.e.* 280 Constitutionals, Sagasta's group; 50 Centralists, Alonzo Martinez's; and 30 Democrats, Marto's, Moret's, etc.), and 121 of the Opposition (*i.e.* 64 Cánovists, 12 Romerists, 9 Dynastic Lefts, 2 Carlists, 9 Possibilistas—Castelar, and 18 Republican-Coalitionists—Salmeron, Pi y Margall, etc.) This was exclusive of the colonies. The election for Senators (April 25) returned 186 Ministerialists, 26 Conservatives (Cánovas), 4 Romerists, 2 Dynastic Lefts, 4 Republicans, and 8 independent candidates. There were also 10 vacant seats of life senators at the disposal of the Government.



When the Cortes assembled a Ministerial crisis was occasioned by a disagreement between the Finance Minister and the Minister of War and the Navy concerning their respective budgets. In the course of a week, however, the difficulty was overcome.

Señor Sagasta (May 10) read the Queen's Speech, which, referring to the King's death, mentioned sundry Bills about to be presented, among them the convention with England; the division of the Fomento (Public Works) department into two parts; the balancing of the Budget; and various other points. Bartolomé, supported by Sagasta, was then elected President of the Congress by 198 votes against 50, and General President of the Senate. The answer to the Queen's Speech was passed by the Senate (May 31) by 135 against 57 votes, Sagasta promising to fulfil his engagements. On this

the alliance of the Romeristas and the Dynastic Left made little promise of solidity, for whilst the former (through Posch) submitted an amendment opposed to democracy, the latter (through Señor Arias) insisted on some such

. In the Congress (June 12) the Republicans declined to take the oath, but made a "promise on their honour"; as also the Carlist Baron Sangarren, adding that Don Carlos de Euzkadi was the only king he acknowledged. The Republicans

publicly declared (May 10) that, despite their promise, they would advocate the establishment of the Republican Government.

Official notice was taken by the Cortes of these reservations, and without delay Señor Camacho proceeded to make his financial statement, which showed a surplus of 16,000,000

(the Queen-Regent having renounced her pension of 250,000 pesetas). In the debate on the reply to the Queen's Speech, which lasted till near the middle of July,

the Deputies (June 23) moved an amendment for economic and administrative autonomy in Cuba, which was rejected by 177 against 17 votes, the Possibilistas voting with the majority, and Castelar not favouring colonial autonomy. The Republicans

then attacked the Civil List, while Señor Romero moved it should be increased (Señor Camacho having reduced it by 1,000,000 pesetas), but the amendment only found eight supporters.

The Anglo-British Commercial Convention, called the Modus Vivendi Bill (a long-pending question, see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1884, p. 330, and 1885, p. 287), after several days' debate,

was passed by the Senate (July 14) by 119 against 54 votes, General Martínez Campos, Blanco (chief of the royal military household) and Salamanca voting with the minority. The Convention

was discussed at great length in Congress (July 17-24), when it was rejected; and by another Bill all commercial treaties lapsing were prolonged till 1892. The Modus Vivendi Bill had

been passed by all the manufacturing districts, and those especially in which commerce was grown. Meetings and deputations to Ministers were held in every place, and each other, representing over one hundred places.

claiming as compensation 50 per cent. reduction of excise, much to the embarrassment of the Government, who finally granted a commission of inquiry. On the other hand, as the Convention depended on England's raising the alcoholic scale on wine from 26° to 30° (for the shilling duty), Seville and other wine-exporting districts had all along been in its favour and given it their strenuous support. All obstacles having been finally removed, the Convention came into force in Spain and England on the same day (Aug. 15).

It was not long, however, before a fresh Cabinet crisis arose, due to the Minister of Public Works (Señor Montero Rios) insisting on reforms which conflicted with Señor Camacho's policy of retrenchment. The latter, therefore, resigned (Aug. 1), being replaced the next day by Señor Pingcerver. An attempt was subsequently made to form a new party (on the lines of the now extinct *La Union Liberal*), under the auspices of General Martinez Campos, Camacho, and others; but no definite result came of the negotiations, and the Session soon after was closed.

The birth of an infant king (May 17) was hailed with satisfaction by all monarchical parties. He was named Alfonso XIII., the Pope standing as sponsor by proxy at the baptism in the Palace Chapel (May 27).

Turning from home to colonial politics, the aspect of affairs was not less satisfactory. At the end of February protocols were exchanged, whereby England recognised Spanish sovereignty over the Carolinas, receiving in return privileges similar to those accorded Germany (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 290), and in March the Spanish flag was hoisted in all the isles of that archipelago.

Public peace was disturbed on more than one occasion, but without serious result. A small band of civilian republicans got possession of the fort of Carthagená (Jan. 11), and held it undiscovered for four-and-twenty hours. The commander, General Fajardo, on learning what had happened, hastened to the fort, and summoned the intruders to surrender. In the struggle which ensued the commandant was severely wounded, and survived only a few days. The insurgents escaped by sea; and the only soldier implicated, a sergeant, was captured, court-martialled, and shot (March 3). This conspiracy, connected with projected risings at Cadiz, Ferrol, and other seaports, might have been more serious had not the Government been forewarned from abroad shortly before. Their vigilance prevented the combination, but Carthagená seems to have been outside the points suspected.

A more serious affair was a *pronunciamiento* which was made at Madrid (Sept. 19), a little before midnight, breaking out at the barracks of San Gil under the leadership of Brigadier-General Villacampa, backed by an infantry and cavalry regiment. Other troops having refused to join, it was put down by 5 A.M. next morning, and the general and other leaders were in full flight.

from Madrid before most of the inhabitants were out of their beds. But meanwhile General Villaverde and Colonel Count de Mirasol (loyalists) had been killed. The state of siege was proclaimed in Madrid. Villacampa was overtaken, and many arrests were made. Villacampa, Lieutenant Serrano, and five subalterns were condemned to death. Subsequently eighty-three soldiers were sentenced to imprisonment for life. Petitions for mercy flowed in with unusual unanimity from the clergy and almost all quarters. Villacampa's daughter was foremost in her efforts, and succeeded even in enlisting the intervention of the Pope. Ministers showed themselves inexorable; but the Queen-Regent was so urgent in her appeal for clemency that they finally gave way, and a general commutation of the sentences was granted (Oct. 5). This increased the Queen's popularity immensely; and some even of the Republican Senators and Deputies went in a body to thank her for her action, and Villacampa himself sent his assurances of loyalty for the rest of his life. But the issue led to the resignation of the Cabinet (Oct. 8); for General Jovellar, Minister at War, who up to the last had opposed clemency, insisted on retiring, as did also two of his colleagues; and a collective withdrawal was ultimately resolved on. The last act, however, of the Cabinet, due to the initiation of Señor Gamazo, should be recorded. The Queen-Regent, on the advice of the Ministers, signed the decree (Oct. 9) by which slave-patronage in Cuba was finally abolished. Señor Sagasta, being charged to form a new Ministry, accomplished his task without difficulty or delay as follows: Señors Sagasta, President; Moret, Foreign Affairs; Leon y Castillo, Gobernacion (Home); Alonzo Martinez, Justice; General Castillo, War; Rear-Admiral Arias, Navy; Navarro Rodrigo, Fomento (Public Works); Pingcerver, Finance; and Balaguer, Colonies. Five of the above had been in the former Cabinet (the President and Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Justice, Finance, and Public Works), the majority being Constitutionalists of the Right; Señors Moret, Pingcerver, and Balaguer alone representing the democratic element. The Ministry, more retrograde than its predecessors, was the outcome of Señor Alonzo Martinez's influence, while Señor Sagasta's prestige was slightly eclipsed. His staunchest supporters seemed to be the Cánovas (Conservatives) and the Democrats under Martos (President of the Congress). At any rate, a falling off in the majority was apparent in the attempt of some to form a so-called "Third Party" (Tercero Partido), which, however, ultimately fell through (Nov. 8), although at one moment it was thought that General Lopez Dominguez and Señor Romero might join its ranks. The failure of these negotiations may be partly attributed to the attitude of the Dynastic Left, who called a meeting in which their principles of universal suffrage &c. were reasserted and confirmed, and General Lopez Dominguez declared his intention of remaining steadfast to the group.

At the reopening of the Cortes (Nov. 18), in virtue of the decree of convocation issued by the new Cabinet, Señor Sagas nounced his determination to carry out to the letter the measure to which he stood committed—an oft-repeated promise, the theme of all his speeches. But up to the end of the year he had done nothing to redeem his promise. In fact, the only noteworthy occurrence of the Session was due to Señor Canalejas who at one of the last sittings, in his eulogy on the Queen-Regent, expressed himself in such a style that his declaration was generally construed as a withdrawal from militant republicanism and an adherence to the monarchy. Disgust at the Radical Government was no doubt uppermost in his mind on taking this unexpected move. *Gladiatorem in arena capere consilium.*

The position of the press in Spain showed during the Session that it could not look for more leniency from the self-styled Liberal Fusionists than it had received at the hands of the Conservatives. As an instance, the Government procurator (December) claimed thirty years' imprisonment for the proprietor of *La Publicidad*, from the Court at Granada, on the plea of an offensive article; whilst in Murcia *El Liberal Pensamiento* made the object of clerical excommunication.

The Duke of Seville, a member of the Royal Family, who had been arrested for disrespectful words to the Queen-Regent (ANNUAL REGISTER, 1885, p. 294), was condemned by court-martial to eight years' confinement and to be struck off the army rolls (26). He would probably have been pardoned but for some letters written from prison. He was sent to Mahon (Balears Island) whence he made his escape (Sept. 15), and published a manifesto of a democratic nature, which appeared (Oct. 1) in *La République* of Tarbes, France.

The Dynamiters did some material damage on several occasions, the church of San Luiz being one of the scenes of their exploits. But a more serious attempt was thwarted by the discovery (Feb. 12), at a shoemaker's in Madrid, of a quantity of firearms and "dynamite enough to blow up the whole town," as was stated in the evidence. At the trial it transpired that the conspiracy had ramifications at Barcelona, Malaga, Cordova, Seville, and a general Anarchist rising had been intended.

## V. PORTUGAL.

The King's Speech at the opening of the Cortes (Jan. 2) was chiefly to financial and administrative Bills. In the absence of more serious subjects of dissension, a squabble between the towns of Braga and Guimaraens, which had been going on for some time past, was ultimately to bring about the downfall of the Cabinet. The township (concelho) of Guimaraens had not been included in the administrative district of Braga,

annoyance, latterly, of certain local magnates, who desired to see incorporated in the district of Oporto. Braga itself naturally opposed the scheme, whilst even the inhabitants of Guimaraens were far from unanimous in favour of cession. Ministers for a while withheld their views on the matter; but it was believed that they favoured the disunionists of Guimaraens. Moreover, the civil governor, appointed in the previous year to Braga, the Marquis de Vallada, had given such a bias to his policy that local feeling soon became roused. This question was taken up by the Cortes at the very beginning of the session, and gave rise to repeated interpellations, but elicited no definite expression of opinion from Ministers beyond the recall of the obnoxious governor. The answer to the King's Speech was promptly disposed of by the Deputies (Jan. 27 to Feb. 3), and occupied but one sitting in the other House (Feb. 3), the Opposition having formally declared they would take no part in the debate. The Finance Minister then laid his fiscal measures on the table of the lower House (Feb. 6), consisting of six Bills: (1) establishing (115 articles) a general tax on moveable property in lieu of all taxes affecting incomes and of a sumptuary nature &c.; (2) schedules relating to same; (3) reform of fiscal system in the provinces and adjacent islands; (4) customs dues reform; (5) modifying the excise (*real d'agua*); (6) extraordinary budget of 1886–87. The first and fifth met with a most hostile reception from the press, including even some *Regenerador* organs, and ultimately led to protests at public meetings held in different parts of the kingdom. It was shown, amongst other things, that while the excise on spirits was diminished, that on meat, bread, and wine would be increased; that the scheme implied the necessity of restoring the odious system of *octrois* ("barreiras"); that anonymous companies would be taxed 15 per cent. on all dividends (except those derived from State funds) &c.

By Art. 10 of the Additional Act (1851) to the Constitution, all treaties, before ratification, must be submitted to the Cortes. In the previous year (Aug. 12) a treaty with Dahomey had been ratified, whereby Portugal assumed the protectorate over that African kingdom, and was further notified to foreign Powers, without ever having been laid on the table of either House. An interpellation on the subject, originating with the Republican deputy Senhor Conseghieri Pedrozo, commenced (Feb. 10), and was still under debate when the Cabinet fell.

This otherwise impending event was the immediate outcome of a declaration made by the new civil governor of Braga, that the integrity of the district would be maintained. Questioned thereupon in the two Chambers (Feb. 15 and 16), Ministers replied that the governor's words did not commit the Cabinet to any definite policy. This disavowal (which a day or two later induced the governor to resign) increased the local agitation and widened its range, for at the same time it oozed out that



Government proposed to abolish the district of Vianna, and make it over to Braga as a compensation for the loss of Guimaraens. Two days later, the Dahomey treaty being under discussion, the Chamber of Deputies broke up in a violent confusion. A council of Ministers followed thereon, lasting from 9 P.M. till 4 A.M. Next day Senhor Fontes, the Premier, went to the Palace and asked for a temporary suspension of the Cortes, pending a settlement of the Braga affair. The King having refused, the Cabinet resigned, and Senhor José Luciano de Castro, leader of the Progressistas, was called to form a new Ministry. This was composed (Feb. 20) as follows: Senhores José Luciano de Castro, Presidency and Kingdom (Home); Francisco Antonio da Veiga Beiram, Justice; Marianno Cyrillo de Carvalho, Finance; Visconde de San Januario, War; Henrique de Barros Gomes, Foreign Affairs; Henrique de Macedo Pereira Coutinho, Navy; and Emygdio Julio Navarro, Public Works. Of the above Senhores Castro, Barros Gomes, and San Januario had been members of the last Progressista Cabinet (1879-1881); the others were Deputies taking office for the first time. Senhor Carvalho was also editor of *O Diario Popular*, formerly nicknamed "O poder occulto" (the occult power), on account of his influence when the party was last in office. Senhor Navarro was editor of *O Progressista*.

When the new Ministry met the Chambers (Feb. 22) the Premier at once declared that their chief concern would be the finances, the re-establishment of credit, retrenchment and administrative reforms; no fresh taxes would be called for. He further promised that the Government would maintain the integrity of the Braga district. The ex-Premier took an early opportunity (Feb. 23) of reiterating, "on his word of honour," the assurances that the financial Bills, as alleged out-of-doors, had had no share in his resignation, which was due solely to the King's refusal of his proposal to suspend the session, in order "the better to settle the so-called Braga-Guimaraens question." With respect to the Dahomey protectorate, the new Ministers declared (March 2) that as foreign Powers had been notified, it would be against diplomatic precedents to raise a question in Parliament, but that their predecessors' Act for reorganising the Dahomey district (a necessary sequel to the treaty) would be submitted to the Cortes for sanction or rejection, as they thought fit. The vexed question of the fiscal guard (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 297) was settled amicably by decree (March 19). There being no time to frame a new Budget, a Bill of Ways and Means was brought in, and passed both Houses (April 5 and 7). Other Bills of minor account, or of mere routine, were also voted. The only subject which gave rise to discussion was a Bill increasing the Crown Prince's civil list up to 40 contos per annum, on account of his approaching marriage, with a grant of 100 contos to the King for outlay on the occasion. The few Republicans in

he Cortes were its only opponents, and it passed the Deputies by 70 against 4 votes (March 24), and in the House of Peers (April 1) without opposition, saving only that of Senhor Latino Coelho, an ex-Minister of 1869, and an eminent man of letters. The Cortes were closed April 8.

The marriage of the Prince Royal, Don Carlos, with the Princesse Amélie d'Orleans, eldest daughter of the Comte de Paris (bringing with her a dowry of 10,000,000 francs), was celebrated (May 22) in Lisbon, at the church of San Domingos, the Comte and Comtesse de Paris attending, with other members of the Orleans family, and several foreign princes of the blood, among them Prince George of Wales. Although this event was subsequently utilised by the French Government in passing the law of expulsion, it was viewed very differently at the time. The French Minister at Lisbon, M. Billot, was raised to the rank of Special Ambassador to represent the President of the Republic at the ceremony; and M. Billot, on delivery of his credentials (May 21), made use of the following words: "... and the sympathy with which my Government looks upon a union which will establish a further tie between the two nations." The speech doubtless had not been dictated by the French Foreign Office, as subsequently asserted; but it was met with no formal disapproval, inasmuch as M. Billot was after the ceremony maintained in his former quality of French Minister at Lisbon. As a sequel to the marriage, a decree of amnesty to political prisoners for election and press offences, and of commutation in favour of different classes of criminals under durance, was gazetted.

During the recess the Government occupied itself in issuing a number of dictatorial decrees (July 21 to Sept. 20), of which the most important were: (1) a new administrative code, of which the main feature was the substitution of irremovable for elective judges, so as to destroy party influences, practically despotic, and assure independence to district courts of justice; (2) a law regulating civil pensions; (3) abolition of the salt-tax; (4) reform of the engineer corps; (5) new judicial organisation; (6) altering the law of 1845 allowing subsidies to deputies, and limiting them to four months' salary (100 milreis per month), however long the session should last; (7) abolition of the ordinary judges, and reforming the tribunals of district judges and justices of the peace; (8) a new penal code, consisting of 486 clauses. The Opposition, of course, raised loud cries at such displays of arbitrary power; but as the occasional assumption of the dictatorship for a specific purpose is a fact in Portugal, to which all parties must plead guilty, this wholesale application of the principle was condoned by public opinion, partly through indifference, partly by approval of some of the measures pending the "Bill of Indemnity," to be presented in the ensuing session.

During the King's absence on a voyage in Northern Europe (Aug. 2 till Sept. 26)—during which he avoided French soil, whence his son's father-in-law was now an exile—the Regency devolved to the Prince Royal, the Cortes being extraordinarily convoked (Sept. 9) to receive his oath *pro forma*. A decree (Oct. 14) having fixed Nov. 14 for the administrative elections (district juntas, municipalities, &c.), the result was that, out of nearly 300 *concelhos* (townships), only forty-two returned Opposition candidates, one place alone (Grandolla, province of Alentejo) showing its Republican sympathy.

A Concordat was signed with the Vatican (June 29) defining the diocese in the East and regulating the Portuguese Crown patronage in those parts; and a Boundary Treaty was concluded with Germany (Dec. 30) touching possessions of the two Powers in Africa. The Sultan of Zanzibar having imprisoned a Portuguese subject in April, contrary to treaty stipulations, the affair was settled by the man's release, and a salute to the Portuguese flag. Towards the end of the year two native revolts in Africa (Angola and Mozambique districts) were suppressed by military expeditions.

## VI. DENMARK.

The year contributed nothing towards the settlement of the long political conflict between the Danish people and their king whilst owing to the deadlock resulting thereupon all beneficial and useful legislation has been postponed.

In the autumn of 1885 the Folkething (the Lower House of the Danish Rigsdag) had rejected the Budget for the financial year of 1886–87, and when the Rigsdag reassembled in December after the adjournment attendant upon the attack on the life of Mr. Estrup, the Prime Minister, Mr. Alberti, a member of the Folkething, brought in at once, as private Bills, the three "provisional" laws which had been promulgated by the Government immediately after the attack on the Premier: one ordering the formation of a military gendarmerie corps, another authorising the Treasury to increase the police force, and the third restricting the liberty of the press and of public meetings (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 303). All these proposals were rejected clearly showing the spirit with which the Liberal party were likely to meet all Government measures on the reassembling of the Rigsdag after the Christmas holidays (Jan. 7).

Shortly before the adjournment a joint Commission of the two Houses had been appointed to consider a Bill for undertaking public works, in order to meet the prevailing distress among the unemployed; but as the Committee had not been able to come to any agreement, the Bill was brought before the Rigsdag, and finally passed (Jan. 14 and 15) by both Houses, but in such an altered form that it was eventually abandoned. The Government meanwhile had laid (Jan. 11) before the Folkething a proposi-

or a duty on corn, with the view of improving the condition of agricultural affairs, but no progress was made with this Bill. About the same time the High Court of Justice confirmed the judgment of the Lower Court against Mr. Berg, the leader of the liberals and the President of the Folkething, in the Holstebro affair (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 301). By the Court Mr. Berg had been sentenced to six months' imprisonment on ordinary prison fare, and on the result of the appeal being declared he at once resigned his position as the President of the Folkething. The Liberal majority in this House, however, at once re-elected him as a protest against the verdict. It was therefore under Mr. Berg's presidency that the Folkething took up the consideration of the Government measure, proposing to add the supplementary law to the Constitution laid before the Rigsdag on its reassembly in the previous December. The object of this Bill was, when all other constitutional means to arrive at an agreement on the Budget had failed, to appoint a Select Committee of ten members of each House, which should finally decide the points in dispute. The Folkething, however, seemed in no way inclined to entertain this proposal, and threw out the Bill on its first reading. This was the last occasion on which Mr. Berg presided in this session before he entered upon his term of imprisonment (Jan. 24).

In the Landsting the Government had in the meantime withdrawn their Bill for the improvement of the national defences, which had been laid before this House at the beginning of the session, and introduced in its place (Jan. 23) the Budget for the coming year, which the Folkething had rejected in the previous October (*see ANNUAL REGISTER*, 1885, p. 302). It was promptly read a first time (Jan. 25), and although the Liberal minority in the Upper House expressed themselves strongly against this unconstitutional procedure, the Bill was allowed to pass the second reading, subject to the appointment of a Committee to report on the Budget.

The Government next issued a royal decree authorising the Treasury to pay the current expenses of the State. Upon this a motion was made in the Folkething protesting against this course, but the discussion resulted only in the motion being referred to a Committee. Simultaneously the Folkething passed a vain protest against the arrest of its President, and it again re-elected him (Feb. 4), although he was "lawfully" excused from presiding. On the same day the Folkething elected Messrs. Hörup and Högsbro as Vice-Presidents. The former, editor of the Radical newspaper *Politiken*, had only the same day been acquitted by the High Court of Justice on a charge of having published offensive matter against the King in his newspaper.

The Committee in the Landsting made its report on the Budget; which at once (Feb. 3) came before the House, and was read the second time (Feb. 6). The prorogation of the Rigsdag (Feb. 8),

however, prevented further progress, and was followed (Feb. 10) by a "provisional" law, fixing the revenue and expenses of the State for the remainder of the financial year. On the same day a royal decree was also issued, ordering the commencement of a series of public works, with the object of relieving the distress among the working classes. Before the close of the financial year (March 26) a "provisional" Budget for 1886-87 was promulgated, and was followed by a royal decree (April 2) fixing the amounts to be expended by the different departments.

An important feature of the programme of the Ministerial party had been the improvement of the defences of the capital, against which the Liberals energetically opposed both in and out of the Rigsdag. The Liberals were of opinion that the building of expensive fortifications &c. around the capital was nothing else than doing work for the benefit of the enemy. They argued that Denmark was in danger of being forced into war only by one of the great Powers, in all probability Germany, which it would be impossible to resist, and the enemy would eventually occupy the capital in spite of its fortifications. The Liberals, therefore, held that the money might be applied to better purposes than building forts for the future use and benefit of the enemy.

In the "provisional" Budget as promulgated there were naturally large amounts set down for these proposed defences of Copenhagen, which the Government were at liberty to apply at their pleasure. The first works of the kind were begun in May by the erection of a coast battery at Charlottenlund. In the meantime the Conservative party had issued an appeal to the country for voluntary contributions towards a fund to assist in carrying out the Government plan of the national defences. The wealthy and commercial classes responded with alacrity and liberality, and the Government at once began the erection of a small fort (Garderhöien) for the defence of the capital from attacks by land.

These works in connection with the proposed fortifications for Copenhagen furnished throughout the year the great topic to which public discussion and attention were directed. The Conservatives accused the Liberals of want of patriotism, and insisted upon a settlement of this question without mixing it up with party politics. The Liberals, on the other hand, determined not to sanction these wild and warlike plans of the Ministry. The funds necessary for carrying out these plans will in all likelihood be obtainable only by means of "provisional" Budgets, and so long as the government of the country is carried on irrespective of the ordinary principles of constitutionalism.

In the meantime the Government, by aid of the "provisional" laws against the freedom of the press and public speaking, continued to prosecute throughout the country writers



speakers who in any way expressed opinions hostile to the official course of action. Officials, schoolmasters, and others holding public appointments of Liberal views who ventured to utterance in public to their political sympathies were unmoniously dismissed; several members of the Folkething and a number of editors of Liberal newspapers were sentenced to imprisonment, varying from one to six months, for having in the eyes of the authorities spoken or written offensively of the King or the Government, or for having taken part in the movement for supplying arms to the volunteer rifle clubs of the country.

The farmers in numerous cases continued, as they had done in the previous year, to refuse to pay taxes, and executions were resorted to for the enforcement of their payment. The state of affairs was very critical—the country being virtually, though ostensibly, almost under martial law. Few nationalities in Europe would have submitted to such an arbitrary rule as that of Mr. Esmark and his Ministry, but the orderly and peaceful instincts of Danish people helped them to carry on persistently their war against the Estrup Cabinet by the very limited constitutional means left to them.

In the course of the prosecutions against the press it had come to light that some of the editors had tried to evade the law by themselves by putting forward "men of straw" as the responsible parties. The Government in reply issued (Aug. 13) a further "provisional" law against the liberty of the press, by which the substitution of fictitious for responsible editors was considered both difficult and dangerous; a step which the Conservatives at once declared had "a moderating influence on the use of the Liberal press."

During the early part of the summer there were few public meetings held by the Liberal party, but soon after the liberation of Mr. Berg from prison (July 24) their numbers increased. The Liberals had decided to celebrate the release of Mr. Berg by a great public demonstration, at which representatives from all parts of the country were to be present. The Committee selected Helsingør, a favourite resort of the Copenhagen people, for the gathering, but the Government at once issued an order prohibiting any public festivity in honour of the President of the Folkething on any land belonging to the State. The Committee, enraged at this despotic action of the Government, sent a message to Landskrona on the opposite Swedish coast to ask permission to celebrate the festivity there; but the Swedish authorities, no doubt influenced by the Danish Government, refused the desired permission. It was then decided to hold the celebration at a public place of amusement at Helsingör, and on the day fixed (July 5) nearly a thousand persons proceeded thither by steamer from Copenhagen, where the festival passed off amid great enthusiasm for Mr. Berg.

In the autumn Mr. Berg and others of the Liberal leaders organised a series of public meetings throughout the country. At some of these it transpired that a section of the party, represented by Count Holstein-Ledreborg, was inclined to give up the "withering" policy, as it has been called by the Conservatives, with which they had carried on the war with the Estrup Ministry for so many years, without, however, indicating any means by which an agreement could be come to with the Government and the Upper House on the most pressing questions of the day. The Conservative press hailed this new departure with delight, and announced the failure of Mr. Berg's "withering" policy, and argued that he no longer could be considered the leader of the Liberal party; but nothing occurred during the year to show that Mr. Berg had any intention of withdrawing from his recognised position. The Conservatives also held a number of meetings during the summer, at several of which some of the Ministers appeared and spoke.

When the Rigsdag reassembled (Oct. 4) some new elections for both Houses had taken place during the recess, but the position of the parties remained unchanged. The Government at once introduced the Budget for the coming financial year, and a considerable number of Bills were laid before both Houses. Among the more important was one for the conversion of the National Debt from 4 to  $3\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. An arrangement had been entered into with some Copenhagen and foreign banking houses for this purpose, and, as it was necessary to have the Bill passed by a certain time, it was rapidly passed through the two Houses and became law (Nov. 12), the Liberals having no object in obstructing a Bill which would reduce the public expenditure. The Budget having been read for the first time in the Folkething (Oct. 13) was referred to a Committee without any debate, instead of being thrown out at once. The Committee was appointed on the following day, but no report had been made by the end of the year. A couple of private Bills, promoted by the Social Democrats of Copenhagen for taking steps to relieve the prevailing distress and for the erection of workmen's dwellings in the capital, received prompt attention at the hands of the Folkething, while a Government Bill for the establishment of a land mortgage bank was summarily disposed of in Committee but with this exception scarcely any of the Government Bills had been considered by the Lower House when the Rigsdag adjourned for the Christmas holidays. So far the Liberal majority in the Lower House had not shown any signs during the session of their wishing to meet the Government proposal in a conciliatory manner. The Landsting on the other hand had shown great activity. Besides passing the Bill for the conversion of the National Debt the Upper House had passed *ten* of the Government Bills through all their stages, and its Committees had reported upon nine other Government measures.

In the autumn a *rapprochement* was made between the two fractions in the Liberal party (see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1883, p. 285, and 1884, p. 337), which resulted (Oct. 25) in a union called "Rigsdagens Venstre" (the Left of the Rigsdag). It was hoped that the united action of both fractions would considerably strengthen the Liberals in their main object—that of overthrowing the Estrup Ministry. It is, however, very uncertain how long it will be possible to keep the advanced fraction of the Left, the so-called "Europeans" or "Literary Left," together with the more moderate Liberals.

At the end of the year there was very little appearance of the Folkething coming to an agreement with the Government on the Budget, and a dissolution of the Rigsdag was therefore expected at an early date in the new year. In this expectation both parties busily prepared themselves for the new elections.

The economic condition of the country during the present year was not prosperous, and the agricultural classes especially suffered. The Government, however, did their best to assist the farmers, and during the year it obtained a loan of five million kroner from the Landmandsbank, in Copenhagen, for the purpose of assisting the farmers by loans at a moderate rate of interest.

## VII. NORWAY.

It was generally expected that when the Liberal Ministry came into power after the long constitutional struggle between the King and the people that the party would continue to work in harmony with its leaders and their chief, Mr. John Sverdrup, and that in consequence the State machinery would run smoothly for many years. The Sverdrup Ministry had taken office in June 1884, and up to the end of the following year everything seemed to confirm this. The course of events, however, during the present year has unfortunately already shown that serious dissensions exist in the Liberal camp. Wise counsels may still prevail and the breach may still be healed. At the close of the year, however, the prospects were less bright than at its opening, and the hopes of a speedy reconciliation were not very promising. The Liberal party in Norway may be said to be split up into two factions, the Moderate Liberals or the "Old Left," as they call themselves, and the advanced Liberals, who have lately received the name conferred on their Radical confrères in the Danish Folkething, the "Europeans." The latter have expressed no wish to displace the present Government, but have urged upon Mr. Sverdrup and his colleagues the acceptance of those more advanced views with regard to the reforms before the Storting which were advocated by Mr. Sverdrup himself when the leader of the Opposition. At the same time, however, the advanced section insisted on the removal of

Jakob Sverdrup, a nephew of the Premier, from the Ministry. They accused him of being reactionary, and of influencing the Prime Minister in that sense. The first symptom of dissension appeared in the Storting during the debate on the grant to a popular author, Mr. Alexander Kielland (*see ANNUAL REGISTER* 1885, p. 325). Another cause for divergence was found in Pastor Jakob Sverdrup's Bill for the establishment of parish councils, which the advanced Liberals pronounced reactionary. Upon the two great reforms which have long occupied the foremost rank in the programme of the Liberal party, the introduction of a jury system in the country and the reorganisation of the army, the party was fully agreed, but neither of these measures was passed during the year's session.

The Storting on assembling (Feb. 1.), after deciding on the validity of the general elections, which had taken place in the preceding autumn, next elected Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the two Houses. The elections had resulted in the return of 31 Liberals and 32 Conservatives. Among the latter were Mr. E. Lieben and Mr. Holmboe, both members of Mr. Selmer's condemned Ministry, who by the verdict of the Rigsret had been condemned to be discharged from their offices. In view therefore of Section 44 of the Constitution, under which the right of vote, and consequently of election, to the National Assembly is withdrawn from any who, among other reasons for disqualification, may have been discharged from any public position, the Storting declared these two elections invalid. This was a great blow to the Conservative party, but the Storting was supported by the public in their duty as presented by the law of the land.

The Storting was then formally opened (Feb. 18) by the King in person. The Speech from the Throne referred to a Bill for the establishment of Post Office Savings Banks, first introduced in the previous session; to a Bill for the building and improvement of harbours, and to the Bills for trial by jury for the reorganisation of the army, as well as the proposed reform in church matters—the Bill for creating parish councils. The last-named was early brought before the Storting, but after some discussion it was agreed to postpone its consideration to the following session, in consequence of the divergence of opinion on this matter both inside and outside the Storting. The Liberal party had long been in favour of placing the election of clergymen in the hands of the parishioners, and as far back as 1884 they had carried a Bill for throwing open churches to others besides the parish ministers, but upon the advice of the Conservative Ministry the Bill was vetoed. Both of these church reforms were now included in the Government measures. It proposed, moreover, to establish parish councils, with a right to exercise certain church discipline over the parishioners as well as over all who were qualified to vote in the elections of these councils. It was, however, to the clauses giving exceptions

powers to these councils that the objections of the advanced Liberals were chiefly raised, and at the close of the year there seemed little chance of the adoption of the Bill by the Storting.

There were in all fourteen amendments to the Government Bill for the extension of the suffrage by private members, of which that in favour of universal suffrage by the veteran member, Mr. Sören Jaabæk, was the most important. All, however, were rejected, either unanimously or by large majorities.

Another long debate took place with reference to the grant to Mr. Alexander Kielland, which had been refused in the previous year by 60 votes against 49. This year Mr. Björnstjerne Björnson, the well-known poet, in the exercise of his right, again proposed a grant of 1,600 kroners (90*l.*) to Mr. Kielland. When the matter came before the Storting the grant, in the form of a "poet's stipend," was again refused by 60 votes against 54; but it was finally agreed to in the form of a "compensation" for the loss suffered by the author through the country having no protection abroad for the copyright of native authors. The vote resulted in a tie, 57 voting on each side, but the President's casting vote was given in Mr. Kielland's favour, and the grant was agreed to.

An important debate took place during the session on a point in connection with the union with Sweden, about which much had been written in the press of both countries. At the time of the Union in 1814, owing to some oversight, nothing had been settled in the Act of the Union with regard to the share that Norway was to have in the transaction of diplomatic affairs with foreign countries. In 1835 the Storting, in an address to the King, expressed a wish that the Norwegian Minister of State and the other two Councillors in attendance upon the King at Stockholm might be admitted to the Swedish Council when foreign business was transacted when the interests of Norway were concerned. A royal resolution was consequently issued to the effect that when the Swedish Foreign Minister was discussing diplomatic matters with the King, which concerned both countries or Sweden only, another Swedish Councillor and the Norwegian Minister at Stockholm should be present, but if the matters concerned Norway alone, the Norwegian Minister alone was to attend the deliberations of the King and his Foreign Secretary. This arrangement proved on more than one occasion unsatisfactory to the Norwegians. In the diplomatic relations of the two countries with foreign Powers Norway had not enjoyed equal right and share with Sweden, as she according to the Act of the Union had a right to expect and demand.

The Swedish Foreign Minister represented both countries, without being in any way responsible to the Norwegian Storting or Government; for there was no clause in the Norwegian Constitution or in the Act of Union in which it was settled that the *Swedish Foreign Minister* was to represent Norway. It was or



by virtue of the royal prescript, which was generally supposed to be temporary, that Norway could claim to make her wishes felt. In 1883 a member of the Swedish Riksdag brought in a private Bill, proposing that diplomatic affairs should be transacted according to the rules applicable to the other business common to the two countries. According to these all administrative business was transacted at Stockholm by a joint council of the Swedish Ministry and the delegates of the Norwegian Ministry, or of three members of the Swedish Ministry and the whole of the Norwegian Ministry if the council were held in the Norwegian capital. To this the Norwegians could take no objection, as it fully maintained the principle of equal rights on which the Union was based, but the proposal was rejected by the Committee to which it had been referred for report, and the Swedish Riksdag in its place passed a Bill in accordance with the existing regulations, except that Sweden should thereafter be represented by three instead of two of her Ministers when transacting foreign business with the King. The Swedish Government then opened up negotiations with the Norwegian Ministry to have a similar Bill passed in the Norwegian Storting, so that a clause might be inserted in the Act of Union between the two countries with reference to the conduct of foreign or diplomatic business, offering in the course of the negotiations to admit two instead of one of the Norwegian Ministers to their joint councils. This proposal did not, however, meet with approval in Norway. The Norwegians, looking upon the Act of Union as a final contract, not in any way to be modified or enlarged, oppose any additions or amendments which might draw the bonds of the Union more tightly than was agreed to in 1814. From the Swedish side on several occasions attempts have been made to add some new bond or clause to the Act of Union, always with the aim of giving to Sweden greater preponderance in the Union. When the subject was this year (June) brought before the Storting the Norwegian Government intimated its intention of bringing in a Bill to modify a clause in the Act of Union, by which "the members of the Norwegian Ministry should in future take part in the transaction of foreign affairs," and that they also promised to lay before the next Storting a Bill for adding to the Norwegian Constitution a clause, "that the King will decide diplomatic matters only after having *always* heard the members of the Norwegian Ministry at Stockholm." To the Swedish advances the Storting replied by a resolution to the effect that they would assist the Government in its endeavours to obtain that equal right in the management of foreign business which Norway in virtue of its independent and equal position in the Union could demand. The Norwegian Government expressed sympathy with and adherence to this resolution, and recognised cheerfully the patriotic efforts of the Storting to protect the independence of the country. Up to this the negotiations between the two Governments fell through.

and the matter was allowed to slumber for another year. The matter was now again taken up by the Liberal press of Norway, and it soon appeared that the only conditions under which the Norwegians would entertain any arrangement for the conduct of the foreign business for the two countries was by a council consisting of three Norwegian and an equal number of Swedish Ministers, and that the Minister of Foreign Affairs might be either a Norwegian or a Swede. Meetings were held in many parts of the country in support of this mode of settling the matter. But this proposal met with the greatest opposition in the Swedish press, which proclaimed that Sweden could only consent to the Foreign Minister being a Swede, who should have no responsibility to the Norwegian Storting. This controversy created much ill-feeling against Norway in certain circles in Sweden, although several of the Liberal party and a few papers upheld the right of Norway to an equal share in the foreign department of the State. Throughout this discussion the Norwegian Government had been in thorough concord with the feeling expressed in the country, for the Premier had even said in the Storting that if an arrangement could not be arrived at which gave Norway an equal right and share in these transactions "there was nothing left but to take the matter into their own hands," which they, according to the Norwegian Constitution and the Act of Union, had full right to do. At the yearly meeting of the Liberal Union held at Hamar (Sept. 17) a resolution was adopted to the effect: "That the meeting expresses its adherence to the settlement of the conduct of foreign business on the basis of the proposed Government Bill and Mr. Qvam's (a prominent Liberal) amendment of Section 28 of the Constitution." Mr. Konow, another Liberal member, proposed a rider: "That the meeting is of the opinion that the constitutional relations between the two countries ought not to be extended even if offered on the terms of equal rights." This amendment, however, was not accepted by the meeting, but at a great many meetings held afterwards both the resolution and the rider were carried. At a public dinner to the Government at Lillehammer, however, it appeared as if the Prime Minister had moderated his views, for he then expressed his preference for an arrangement by which the Foreign Minister, either Norwegian or Swede, should be made answerable to a delegation, composed of an equal number of members from the National Assemblies of the two countries. The advanced Liberal press again took up the discussion of the subject, urging upon the Prime Minister to remain true to his original position in the matter. In Sweden the Conservative papers continued the agitation against the Norwegians, accusing them of wishing to break up the Union or to assume a superior position in it, and giving proof of the survival of the old rooted feeling against the Norwegians asserting an independent position in the Union.

*The Government Bills for Post Office Savings Bank, the re*

organisation of the army, and the introduction of jury were again postponed. A Committee was appointed to meet in the autumn to complete the work connected with the latter reform. During the session the Government laid a proposal before the Storthing for an appanage of 14,000 kr. (770*l.*) for Prince Oscar, the King's second son, but it was withdrawn before it came on for discussion. The King accompanied the proposal by a long personal explanation for making this application, but it was received with little favour; and a similar application having been made to the Swedish Riksdag, where it was refused by both Houses, it was found advisable to withdraw the Bill in the Storthing, where its rejection was a foregone conclusion.

The Storthing granted 400,000 kr. (21,111*l.*) more than the Government had asked for new roads and other improvements of the communications in the country. It also gave a yearly grant of 4,000 kr. (211*l.*) to a useful institution, the new Workmen's College at Christiania, which was established in the course of the year on the same plan as the successful Workmen's College established seven years previously in Stockholm. The Budget showed expenses to the amount of 43,200,000 kr. (2,400,000*l.*), and revenue to the same amount, a balance being thus obtained without resorting to any new taxation. Shortly before the Storthing was prorogued (June 23) it sanctioned the conversion of about twenty-four million kroners of the National Debt from 4 to 3½ per cent., the new loan being eventually made with Messrs. Hambro & Sons, of London.

During the summer and autumn a number of meetings by both parties were held in various parts of the country. The Conservative party, having no specific programme to lay before the electors, appealed to the people to protect Christianity and the Constitution against the attacks that were being made upon both by the Liberals, hoping thereby to gain some support among the peasantry, and especially to influence them against the advanced Liberals, the so-called "Europeans."

In June Mr. Björnstjerne Bjornson, who had been living in Paris for the last four years, paid a long visit to his native country. He had a magnificent reception on his arrival at Christiania, in spite of the Conservative spirit of the town. It will be remembered that he was one of the most active of the Liberals in the late constitutional struggle. His popularity, however, had not suffered, for never had so large a concourse of people been assembled at Christiania as when he landed amid the ringing hurrahs from the thousands on ship and shore, mingled with the roar of the cannons fired in his honour.

Towards the close of the year a number of serious failures took place in Arendal and other towns in the south of the country. The economical condition of the commercial and manufacturing community was in consequence of this and other causes far from good.

## VIII. SWEDEN.

Sweden has in 1886 passed through another of those years of political tranquillity which, with trifling exceptions, she has for some time been enjoying. It is, however, possible that the Swedes are beginning to awake to the fact that this peaceful state of affairs may arise from political apathy which may not be beneficial to the country, and which tends to relax the interest of the people in public affairs.

The principal matters of interest which promised to occupy the attention of the Swedish Riksdag on its assembly (Jan. 15) were the economical affairs of the country. First among these was the great question of protection, which had been brought before the Riksdag in the previous session, when the protectionists failed to pass any of their proposals. The question had during the recess been the principal topic of political discussion all over the country, and the protectionists especially carried on an active agitation, basing their hopes of success this year on the great agricultural depression. In view of this they first proposed duties on corn, flour, butter, cheese, and other agricultural produce, which of course received the support of the great number of peasant proprietors and other representatives of landed interest in the Riksdag. The free-traders, on the other hand, blamed the farmers for not understanding how to make farming profitable, and protested on behalf of the working classes against all attempts to make bread and other necessities of life dearer.

The Agricultural Exhibition held at Stockholm during the summer did not bear evidence that the Swedish farmers were much behind their foreign competitors, but there were no doubt natural causes which make it impossible for Sweden to compete with the large corn-growing countries of the world. Petitions with nearly 80,000 names in favour of protection on corn and flour were presented to the Riksdag, and when the Budget Committee was appointed it was found that there were eleven protectionists and nine free-traders on the Committee, and on its report the duties on corn and the other agricultural articles already mentioned were submitted. The report was then (March 3) brought up for discussion in the Riksdag, the debate lasting four sittings in the First Chamber and six sittings in the Second Chamber. The former threw out the Bill by 75 against 57 votes, whilst in the latter it was carried by 109 against 105 votes. The Government, which had energetically opposed the protectionist proposals from the beginning, thus suffered a kind of defeat in the popular Chamber, but at the joint meeting of the two Chambers the Bill was finally rejected by 181 against 164 votes. The Government was thus saved, but it was known that *the question would not be dropped by the protectionists,*

however, prevented further progress, and was followed (Feb. 10) by a "provisional" law, fixing the revenue and expenses of the State for the remainder of the financial year. On the same day a royal decree was also issued, ordering the commencement of a series of public works, with the object of relieving the distress among the working classes. Before the close of the financial year (March 26) a "provisional" Budget for 1886-87 was promulgated, and was followed by a royal decree (April 2) fixing the amounts to be expended by the different departments.

An important feature of the programme of the Ministerial party had been the improvement of the defences of the capital, against which the Liberals energetically opposed both in and out of the Rigsdag. The Liberals were of opinion that the building of expensive fortifications &c. around the capital was nothing else than doing work for the benefit of the enemy. They argued that Denmark was in danger of being forced into war only by one of the great Powers, in all probability Germany, which it would be impossible to resist, and the enemy would eventually occupy the capital in spite of its fortifications. The Liberals, therefore, held that the money might be applied to better purposes than building forts for the future use and benefit of the enemy.

In the "provisional" Budget as promulgated there were naturally large amounts set down for these proposed defences of Copenhagen, which the Government were at liberty to apply at their pleasure. The first works of the kind were begun in May by the erection of a coast battery at Charlottenlund. In the meantime the Conservative party had issued an appeal to the country for voluntary contributions towards a fund to assist in carrying out the Government plan of the national defences. The wealthy and commercial classes responded with alacrity and liberality, and the Government at once began the erection of a small fort (Garderhöien) for the defence of the capital from attacks by land.

These works in connection with the proposed fortifications for Copenhagen furnished throughout the year the great topic to which public discussion and attention were directed. The Conservatives accused the Liberals of want of patriotism, and insisted upon a settlement of this question without mixing it up with party politics. The Liberals, on the other hand, determined not to sanction these wild and warlike plans of the Ministry. The funds necessary for carrying out these plans will in all likelihood be obtainable only by means of "provisional" Budgets, and so long as the government of the country is carried on irrespective of the ordinary principles of constitutionalism.

In the meantime the Government, by aid of the "provisional" laws against the freedom of the press and public speaking, continued to prosecute throughout the country writers



id speakers who in any way expressed opinions hostile to the ministerial course of action. Officials, schoolmasters, and others holding public appointments of Liberal views who ventured to utterance in public to their political sympathies were unremotely dismissed; several members of the Folkething and a number of editors of Liberal newspapers were sentenced to imprisonment, varying from one to six months, for having in the eyes of the authorities spoken or written offensively of the King or the Government, or for having taken part in the movement for supplying arms to the volunteer rifle clubs of the country.

The farmers in numerous cases continued, as they had done in the previous year, to refuse to pay taxes, and executions were resorted to for the enforcement of their payment. The state of affairs was very critical—the country being virtually, though not ostensibly, almost under martial law. Few nationalities in Europe would have submitted to such an arbitrary rule as that of Mr. Esmark and his Ministry, but the orderly and peaceful instincts of Danish people helped them to carry on persistently the war against the Estrup Cabinet by the very limited constitutional means left to them.

In the course of the prosecutions against the press it had come to light that some of the editors had tried to evade the law by themselves by putting forward "men of straw" as the responsible parties. The Government in reply issued (Aug. 13) a further "provisional" law against the liberty of the press, by which the substitution of fictitious for responsible editors was rendered both difficult and dangerous; a step which the Conservatives at once declared had "a moderating influence on the one of the Liberal press."

During the early part of the summer there were few public meetings held by the Liberal party, but soon after the liberation of Mr. Berg from prison (July 24) their numbers increased. The Liberals had decided to celebrate the release of Mr. Berg by a great public demonstration, at which representatives from all parts of the country were to be present. The Committee selected Helsingør, a favourite resort of the Copenhagen people, for the gathering, but the Government at once issued an order prohibiting any public festivity in honour of the President of the Folkething on any land belonging to the State. The Committee, enraged at this despotic action of the Government, sent a message to Landskrona on the opposite Swedish coast to ask permission to celebrate the festivity there; but the Swedish authorities, no doubt influenced by the Danish Government, refused the desired permission. It was then decided to hold the celebration at a public place of amusement at Helsingør, and on the day fixed (July 5) nearly a thousand persons proceeded thither by steamer from Copenhagen, where the festival passed off amid great enthusiasm for Mr. Berg.

delight, and announced the failure of Mr. Berg's "with  
policy, and argued that he no longer could be considered  
leader of the Liberal party; but nothing occurred during  
year to show that Mr. Berg had any intention of withdrawing  
from his recognised position. The Conservatives also  
number of meetings during the summer, at several of  
some of the Ministers appeared and spoke.

When the Rigsdag reassembled (Oct. 4) some new elections  
for both Houses had taken place during the recess, but the  
position of the parties remained unchanged. The Government  
at once introduced the Budget for the coming financial year  
and a considerable number of Bills were laid before both Houses.  
Among the more important was one for the conversion of the  
National Debt from 4 to 3½ per cent. An arrangement had been  
entered into with some Copenhagen and foreign banking houses  
for this purpose, and, as it was necessary to have the Bill passed  
by a certain time, it was rapidly passed through the two Houses  
and became law (Nov. 12), the Liberals having no objection to  
obstructing a Bill which would reduce the public expenditure.  
The Budget having been read for the first time in the Rigsdag  
thing (Oct. 13) was referred to a Committee without any delay  
instead of being thrown out at once. The Committee was  
appointed on the following day, but no report had been made  
the end of the year. A couple of private Bills, promoted by the  
Social Democrats of Copenhagen for taking steps to relieve  
prevailing distress and for the erection of workmen's dwellings

In autumn a *rapprochement* was made between the two in the Liberal party (see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1883, p. 1884, p. 337), which resulted (Oct. 25) in a union called *gens Venstre* " (the Left of the Rigsdag). It was hoped united action of both fractions would considerably aid the Liberals in their main object—that of overthrowing the Estrup Ministry. It is, however, very uncertain how well it will be possible to keep the advanced fraction of the Left, called "Europeans" or "Literary Left," together with moderate Liberals.

At the end of the year there was very little appearance of the Opposition coming to an agreement with the Government on the dissolution of the Rigsdag was therefore expected for an early date in the new year. In this expectation both parties were busily preparing themselves for the new elections.

The economic condition of the country during the present year was not prosperous, and the agricultural classes especially

The Government, however, did their best to assist the farmers, and during the year it obtained a loan of five million from the Landmandsbank, in Copenhagen, for the purpose of assisting the farmers by loans at a moderate rate of interest.

## VII. NORWAY.

It was generally expected that when the Liberal Ministry came to power after the long constitutional struggle between the Government and the people that the party would continue to act in harmony with its leaders and their chief, Mr. John Sverdrup, and that in consequence the State machinery would continue to run smoothly for many years. The Sverdrup Ministry had been in office since June 1884, and up to the end of the following year nothing seemed to confirm this. The course of events, however, during the present year has unfortunately already shown that serious dissensions exist in the Liberal camp. Wise measures may still prevail and the breach may still be healed. At the close of the year, however, the prospects were less bright than at its opening, and the hopes of a speedy reconciliation were not very promising. The Liberal party in Norway may be said to have split up into two factions, the Moderate Liberals or the "Moderates," as they call themselves, and the advanced Liberals, who lately received the name conferred on their Radical colleagues in the Danish Folkething, the "Europeans." The Moderates expressed no wish to displace the present Government, but urged upon Mr. Sverdrup and his colleagues the acceptance of those more advanced views with regard to the reforms of the Storting which were advocated by Mr. Sverdrup when he was the leader of the Opposition. At the same time, the advanced section insisted on the removal of Pastor

rank in the programme of the Liberal party, the introduction of a jury system in the country and the reorganisation of the party was fully agreed, but neither of these measures passed during the year's session.

The Storthing on assembling (Feb. 1.), after deciding the validity of the general elections, which had taken place in the preceding autumn, next elected Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the two Houses. The elections had resulted in the return of 32 Liberals and 32 Conservatives. Among the latter were Mr. Lieben and Mr. Holmboe, both members of Mr. Selmer's cabinet, who by the verdict of the Rigsret had been condemned to be discharged from their offices. In view therefore of Section 4 of the Constitution, under which the right of vote, and consequently of election, to the National Assembly is withdrawn from any who, among other reasons for disqualification, have been discharged from any public position, the Storthing declared these two elections invalid. This was a great blow to the Conservative party, but the Storthing was supported by the Liberals in their duty as presented by the law of the land.

The Storthing was then formally opened (Feb. 18) by the King in person. The Speech from the Throne referred to a Bill for the establishment of Post Office Savings Banks, shadowed in the previous session; to a Bill for the building and improvement of harbours, and to the Bills for trial by jury for the reorganisation of the army, as well as the proposals in church matters—the Bill for creating parish councils. The last-named was early brought before the Storthing. 1

powers to these councils that the objections of the advanced Liberals were chiefly raised, and at the close of the year there seemed little chance of the adoption of the Bill by the Storting.

There were in all fourteen amendments to the Government Bill for the extension of the suffrage by private members, of which that in favour of universal suffrage by the veteran member, Mr. Sören Jaabæk, was the most important. All, however, were rejected, either unanimously or by large majorities.

Another long debate took place with reference to the grant to Mr. Alexander Kielland, which had been refused in the previous year by 60 votes against 49. This year Mr. Björnstjerne Björnson, the well-known poet, in the exercise of his right, again proposed a grant of 1,600 kroners (90*l.*) to Mr. Kielland. When the matter came before the Storting the grant, in the form of a "poet's stipend," was again refused by 60 votes against 54; but it was finally agreed to in the form of a "compensation" for the loss suffered by the author through the country having no protection abroad for the copyright of native authors. The vote resulted in a tie, 57 voting on each side, but the President's casting vote was given in Mr. Kielland's favour, and the grant was agreed to.

An important debate took place during the session on a point in connection with the union with Sweden, about which much had been written in the press of both countries. At the time of the Union in 1814, owing to some oversight, nothing had been settled in the Act of the Union with regard to the share that Norway was to have in the transaction of diplomatic affairs with foreign countries. In 1835 the Storting, in an address to the King, expressed a wish that the Norwegian Minister of State and the other two Councillors in attendance upon the King at Stockholm might be admitted to the Swedish Council when foreign business was transacted when the interests of Norway were concerned. A royal resolution was consequently issued to the effect that when the Swedish Foreign Minister was discussing diplomatic matters with the King, which concerned both countries or Sweden only, another Swedish Councillor and the Norwegian Minister at Stockholm should be present, but if the matters concerned Norway alone, the Norwegian Minister alone was to attend the deliberations of the King and his Foreign Secretary. This arrangement proved on more than one occasion unsatisfactory to the Norwegians. In the diplomatic relations of the two countries with foreign Powers Norway had not enjoyed equal right and share with Sweden, as she according to the Act of the Union had a right to expect and demand.

The Swedish Foreign Minister represented both countries, without being in any way responsible to the Norwegian Storting or Government; for there was no clause in the Norwegian Constitution or in the Act of Union in which it was settled that the Swedish Foreign Minister was to represent Norway. It was only



by virtue of the royal prescript, which was generally supposed to be temporary, that Norway could claim to make her wishes felt. In 1883 a member of the Swedish Riksdag brought in a private Bill, proposing that diplomatic affairs should be transacted according to the rules applicable to the other business common to the two countries. According to these all administrative business was transacted at Stockholm by a joint council of the Swedish Ministry and the delegates of the Norwegian Ministry, or of three members of the Swedish Ministry and the whole of the Norwegian Ministry if the council were held in the Norwegian capital. To this the Norwegian could take no objection, as it fully maintained the principle of equal rights on which the Union was based, but the proposal was rejected by the Committee to which it had been referred for report, and the Swedish Riksdag in its place passed a Bill in accordance with the existing regulations, except that Sweden should thereafter be represented by three instead of two of her Ministers when transacting foreign business with the King. The Swedish Government then opened up negotiations with the Norwegian Ministry to have a similar Bill passed in the Norwegian Storting, so that a clause might be inserted in the Act of Union between the two countries with reference to the conduct of foreign or diplomatic business, offering in the course of the negotiations to admit two instead of one of the Norwegian Ministers to their joint councils. This proposal did not, however, meet with approval in Norway. The Norwegians, looking upon the Act of Union as a final contract, not in any way to be modified or enlarged, oppose any additions or amendments which might draw the bonds of the Union more tightly than was agreed to in 1814. From the Swedish side on several occasions attempts have been made to add some new bond or clause to the Act of Union, always with the aim of giving to Sweden greater preponderance in the Union. When the subject was this year (June) brought before the Storting the Norwegian Government intimated its intention of bringing in a Bill to modify a clause in the Act of Union, by which "the members of the Norwegian Ministry should in future take part in the transaction of foreign affairs," and that they also promised to lay before the next Storting a Bill for adding to the Norwegian Constitution a clause, "that the King will decide diplomatic matters only after having *always* heard the members of the Norwegian Ministry at Stockholm." To the Swedish advances the Storting replied by a resolution to the effect that they would assist the Government in its endeavours to obtain that equal right in the management of foreign business which Norway in virtue of its independent and equal position in the Union could demand. The Norwegian Government expressed sympathy with and adhesion to this resolution, and recognised cheerfully the patriotic efforts of the Storting to protect the independence of the country. Up to this the negotiations between the two Governments fell thro

and the matter was allowed to slumber for another year. The matter was now again taken up by the Liberal press of Norway, and it soon appeared that the only conditions under which the Norwegians would entertain any arrangement for the conduct of the foreign business for the two countries was by a council consisting of three Norwegian and an equal number of Swedish Ministers, and that the Minister of Foreign Affairs might be either a Norwegian or a Swede. Meetings were held in many parts of the country in support of this mode of settling the matter. But this proposal met with the greatest opposition in the Swedish press, which proclaimed that Sweden could only consent to the Foreign Minister being a Swede, who should have no responsibility to the Norwegian Storthing. This controversy created much ill-feeling against Norway in certain circles in Sweden, although several of the Liberal party and a few papers upheld the right of Norway to an equal share in the foreign department of the State. Throughout this discussion the Norwegian Government had been in thorough concord with the feeling expressed in the country, for the Premier had even said in the Storthing that if an arrangement could not be arrived at which gave Norway an equal right and share in these transactions "there was nothing left but to take the matter into their own hands," which they, according to the Norwegian Constitution and the Act of Union, had full right to do. At the yearly meeting of the Liberal Union held at Hamar (Sept. 17) a resolution was adopted to the effect: "That the meeting expresses its adherence to the settlement of the conduct of foreign business on the basis of the proposed Government Bill and Mr. Qvam's (a prominent Liberal) amendment of Section 28 of the Constitution." Mr. Konow, another Liberal member, proposed a rider: "That the meeting is of the opinion that the constitutional relations between the two countries ought not to be extended even if offered on the terms of equal rights." This amendment, however, was not accepted by the meeting, but at a great many meetings held afterwards both the resolution and the rider were carried. At a public dinner to the Government at Lillehammer, however, it appeared as if the Prime Minister had moderated his views, for he then expressed his preference for an arrangement by which the Foreign Minister, either Norwegian or Swede, should be made answerable to a delegation, composed of an equal number of members from the National Assemblies of the two countries. The advanced Liberal press again took up the discussion of the subject, urging upon the Prime Minister to remain true to his original position in the matter. In Sweden the Conservative papers continued the agitation against the Norwegians, accusing them of wishing to break up the Union or to assume a superior position in it, and giving proof of the survival of the old rooted feeling against the Norwegians asserting an independent position in the Union.

*The Government Bills for Post Office Savings Bank, the re-*

and the whole of the Norwegian Ministry if the  
were held in the Norwegian capital. To this the Nor  
could take no objection, as it fully maintained the prin  
equal rights on which the Union was based, but the prop  
rejected by the Committee to which it had been refe  
report, and the Swedish Riksdag in its place passed a  
accordance with the existing regulations, except that  
should thereafter be represented by three instead of two  
Ministers when transacting foreign business with th  
The Swedish Government then opened up negotiations  
Norwegian Ministry to have a similar Bill passed in the  
gian Storthing, so that a clause might be inserted in th  
Union between the two countries with reference to the  
of foreign or diplomatic business, offering in the cours  
negotiations to admit two instead of one of the Norwegian  
try to their joint councils. This proposal did not, howev  
with approval in Norway. The Norwegians, looking u  
Act of Union as a final contract, not in any way to be  
or enlarged, oppose any additions or amendments whic  
draw the bonds of the Union more tightly than was agre  
1814. From the Swedish side on several occasions  
have been made to add some new bond or clause to the  
Union, always with the aim of giving to Sweden grea  
ponderance in the Union. When the subject was this yea  
brought before the Storthing the Norwegian Governme  
mated its intention of bringing in a Bill to modify a c  
the Act of Union. by which "the members of the No

the matter was allowed to slumber for another year. The matter was now again taken up by the Liberal press of Norway, it soon appeared that the only conditions under which the Norwegians would entertain any arrangement for the conduct of foreign business for the two countries was by a council consisting of three Norwegian and an equal number of Swedish members, and that the Minister of Foreign Affairs might be either a Norwegian or a Swede. Meetings were held in many parts of the country in support of this mode of settling the matter. This proposal met with the greatest opposition in the Swedish press, which proclaimed that Sweden could only consent to the Foreign Minister being a Swede, who should have no responsibility to the Norwegian Storting. This controversy created much ill-feeling against Norway in certain circles in Sweden, though several of the Liberal party and a few papers upheld the right of Norway to an equal share in the foreign department of the State. Throughout this discussion the Norwegian Government had been in thorough concord with the feeling expressed in the country, for the Premier had even said in the Storting that no arrangement could not be arrived at which gave Norway an equal right and share in these transactions "there was nothing but to take the matter into their own hands," which they, according to the Norwegian Constitution and the Act of Union, had full right to do. At the yearly meeting of the Liberal Union at Hamar (Sept. 17) a resolution was adopted to the effect: "That the meeting expresses its adherence to the settlement of the conduct of foreign business on the basis of the proposed Government Bill and Mr. Qvam's (a prominent Liberal) amendment of Section 28 of the Constitution." Mr. Konow, another Liberal member, proposed a rider: "That the meeting is of the opinion that the constitutional relations between the two countries ought not to be extended even if offered on the terms of equal rights." This amendment, however, was not accepted by the meeting, but at a great many meetings held afterwards both the resolution and the rider were carried. At a public dinner to the Government at Lillehammer, however, it appeared as if the Premier had moderated his views, for he then expressed a preference for an arrangement by which the Foreign Minister, whether Norwegian or Swede, should be made answerable to a commission, composed of an equal number of members from the National Assemblies of the two countries. The advanced Liberals again took up the discussion of the subject, urging upon the Prime Minister to remain true to his original position in the matter. In Sweden the Conservative papers continued the agitation against the Norwegians, accusing them of wishing to break up the Union or to assume a superior position in it, and giving evidence of the survival of the old rooted feeling against the Norwegians asserting an independent position in the Union.

*The Government Bills for Post Office Savings Bank, the re-*


organisation of the army, and the introduction of jury were again postponed. A Committee was appointed to meet in the autumn to complete the work connected with the latter reform. During the session the Government laid a proposal before the Storthing for an appanage of 14,000 kr. (770*l.*) for Prince Oscar, the King's second son, but it was withdrawn before it came on for discussion. The King accompanied the proposal by a long personal explanation for making this application, but it was received with little favour; and a similar application having been made to the Swedish Riksdag, where it was refused by both Houses, it was found advisable to withdraw the Bill in the Storthing, where its rejection was a foregone conclusion.

The Storthing granted 400,000 kr. (21,111*l.*) more than the Government had asked for new roads and other improvements of the communications in the country. It also gave a yearly grant of 4,000 kr. (211*l.*) to a useful institution, the new Workmen's College at Christiania, which was established in the course of the year on the same plan as the successful Workmen's College established seven years previously in Stockholm. The Budget showed expenses to the amount of 43,200,000 kr. (2,400,000*l.*), and revenue to the same amount, a balance being thus obtained without resorting to any new taxation. Shortly before the Storthing was prorogued (June 23) it sanctioned the conversion of about twenty-four million kroners of the National Debt from 4 to 8½ per cent., the new loan being eventually made with Messrs Hambro & Sons, of London.

During the summer and autumn a number of meetings by both parties were held in various parts of the country. The Conservative party, having no specific programme to lay before the electors, appealed to the people to protect Christianity and the Constitution against the attacks that were being made upon both by the Liberals, hoping thereby to gain some support among the peasantry, and especially to influence them against the advanced Liberals, the so-called "Europeans."

In June Mr. Björnstjerne Bjornson, who had been living in Paris for the last four years, paid a long visit to his native country. He had a magnificent reception on his arrival at Christiania, in spite of the Conservative spirit of the town. It will be remembered that he was one of the most active of the Liberals in the late constitutional struggle. His popularity, however, had not suffered, for never had so large a concourse of people been assembled at Christiania as when he landed amid the ringing hurrahs from the thousands on ship and shore, mingled with the roar of the cannons fired in his honour.

Towards the close of the year a number of serious failures took place in Arendal and other towns in the south of the country. The economical condition of the commercial and manufacturing community was in consequence of this and other causes far from good.





## VIII. SWEDEN.

Sweden has in 1886 passed through another of those years of political tranquillity which, with trifling exceptions, she has for some time been enjoying. It is, however, possible that the Swedes are beginning to awake to the fact that this peaceful state of affairs may arise from political apathy which may not be beneficial to the country, and which tends to relax the interest of the people in public affairs.

The principal matters of interest which promised to occupy the attention of the Swedish Riksdag on its assembly (Jan. 15) were the economical affairs of the country. First among these was the great question of protection, which had been brought before the Riksdag in the previous session, when the protectionists failed to pass any of their proposals. The question had during the recess been the principal topic of political discussion all over the country, and the protectionists especially carried on an active agitation, basing their hopes of success this year on the great agricultural depression. In view of this they first proposed duties on corn, flour, butter, cheese, and other agricultural produce, which of course received the support of the great number of peasant proprietors and other representatives of landed interest in the Riksdag. The free-traders, on the other hand, blamed the farmers for not understanding how to make farming profitable, and protested on behalf of the working classes against all attempts to make bread and other necessities of life dearer.

The Agricultural Exhibition held at Stockholm during the summer did not bear evidence that the Swedish farmers were much behind their foreign competitors, but there were no doubt natural causes which make it impossible for Sweden to compete with the large corn-growing countries of the world. Petitions with nearly 30,000 names in favour of protection on corn and flour were presented to the Riksdag, and when the Budget Committee was appointed it was found that there were eleven protectionists and nine free-traders on the Committee, and on its report the duties on corn and the other agricultural articles already mentioned were submitted. The report was then (March 3) brought up for discussion in the Riksdag, the debate lasting four sittings in the First Chamber and six sittings in the Second Chamber. The former threw out the Bill by 75 against 57 votes, whilst in the latter it was carried by 109 against 105 votes. The Government, which had energetically opposed the protectionist proposals from the beginning, thus suffered a kind of defeat in the popular Chamber, but at the joint meeting of the two Chambers the Bill was finally rejected by 181 against 164 votes. The Government was thus saved, but it was known that *the question would not be dropped by the protectionists.*

who hoped to gain over several members before the next meeting of the Riksdag.

In April the question of an appanage for Prince Oscar, the King's second son, came before the Riksdag. The Government had introduced this demand at the instance of the King, who issued a remarkable "dictamen," which was subsequently made public and set forth the reasons which prompted him to ask for this grant to his son. He looked with considerable anxiety to the future of his younger sons, to whom, he declared, he had given an excellent education, but who were debarred by the law of the country from following any profession, or in any other way making an independent position for themselves, open to all other young men in the country. He held, therefore, that he was only in his right in asking the State to contribute towards maintaining the prince in a way befitting their position. He only proposed on the present occasion that an appanage should be granted to his second son, but intimated that he would make similar proposals for his other sons at a subsequent date. The Government, in laying the Bill for an appanage to Prince Oscar before the Riksdag, proposed a grant of 26,000 kroners (1,445*l.*), but the Budget Committee unanimously rejected the proposal, owing, as they put it, "to the economical depression in the country." When the Bill came before the Second Chamber it was thrown out unanimously without even being discussed, and in the First Chamber it was likewise rejected, the division being 74 against, and 41 votes for, the grant. It must not, however, be conjectured that the majority in the Riksdag refused the appanage on account of any Republican sympathies. The grant was simply refused because the "Landtmanna" party held that royalty was unnecessarily expensive already. It may here be noted that the yearly grant to royalty in Sweden is about 74,000*l.*, and in Norway about 24,000*l.*

Among the measures passed during the session may be mentioned a Bill for compensation from the National Exchequer for wrongful imprisonment, and another for compensation to witnesses in criminal cases. A Bill for the better protection of the right of Swedish Lapps to grazing their reindeer in Sweden was also agreed to.

From the divisions in the joint meetings of the two Chambers at the latter end of the session it was seen that the "Landtmanna" party (see ANNUAL REGISTER, 1880, page 241) for the first time was in a majority in the Riksdag. Hitherto they had only been in a majority in the Second Chamber, the principal point in their programme being retrenchment in the public expenditure, especially in the army and the navy.

The Budget showed a revenue of 84,830,600 kronor (4,713,000*l.*), including a surplus of 8 million kroners from 1879 and the preceding year. The expenditure as voted was limited to the exact amount of the revenue.

During the year the Conservative press in Sweden continued the agitation against the Norwegians with regard to the position the latter had taken up in the settlement of conducting the diplomatic business of the two countries, and to which reference was made in last year's article on Sweden as well as in that of the present year on Norway. It is not, however, likely that this agitation will lead to any serious misunderstanding between the two countries.

Several lines of railway, connecting various important parts of the extensive Swedish railway system, were opened by the King during the year.

The general state of commerce, industry, and agriculture has not been good, and a great number of failures were reported in the principal commercial centres.

## CHAPTER V.

### ASIA.

#### INDIA, CENTRAL ASIA, AFGHANISTAN, CHINA, AND JAPAN.

THE most important events of 1886, as far as the outer relations of India are concerned, and those on which the attention of both statesmen and the public has been chiefly concentrated, are the proceedings of the Anglo-Russian Delimitation Commission on the Afghan frontier, the progress of pacification in Upper Burmah, and the abortive mission to Thibet, whilst within her frontiers the critical position of the Imperial finances, and the various methods of tiding over the prospective calamity foreshadowed by the continued appreciation of gold with reference to silver, have absorbed to an equal degree the interests of both political and commercial bodies. In other respects the year has been singularly unmarked by striking incidents of any but transient importance.

The financial difficulties in which the Government of India found itself likely to be placed at no long distance of time, though due ultimately to the depreciation of silver as compared with the rarer metal, were to a great extent brought about by the events transpiring in the surrounding countries rather than to the internal policy of the State. It is with the former, therefore, that this review will more appropriately begin.

*The Boundary Commission.*—On Nov. 1, or almost exactly two years after the English and the Indian contingents had met at Kuhsan, Sir West Ridgeway brought his expedition to a close at Peshawar, and a few days later received the congratulations and public thanks of the Government, expressed in full Durbar by Lord Dufferin, at Lahore. The actual work of the calendar year, which is all that is strictly relevant to the scope of this

review, will be related below; but, owing to the lapse of time since the inception of the undertaking and the frequent interruptions that occurred during the course of its execution, it will be useful to recall briefly the main results of the whole. In the first place, from the very start the journey was made of use in procuring surveys and general information regarding the nature of the route to Herat by Quettah, the Helmund, and the west frontier of Afghanistan. It was found by experience that an expedition carrying, in addition to the ordinary equipment of a field force, a collection of survey and other scientific instruments and requirements, could successfully, and without loss or inconvenience, traverse the 800 miles between the British outpost and the once-called "Key to India," and that the Baluch desert, the Seisthan swamp, and the fanatical robber chiefs of the Afghan-Persian border presented no serious obstacles.

The delay that took place before the Russian party joined their English colleagues was utilised in surveying, and in procuring information regarding the tract about to be traversed, together with other expeditions into parts of Afghanistan north of Herat, as far as the Oxus.

The capture of Panjdeh by the Russians was followed by the fortification of Herat under British supervision, and by the establishment of a more cordial state of feeling towards the foreigners on the part of the Afghan chiefs and the tribes in the hill-country adjoining the Turkoman plain in dispute. In Oct. 1885 part of the expedition was sent back to India, and the rest joined the Russian party at Zulfikar, where the work was to begin. The actual point of commencement had been previously settled by protocol in London, but after the first few weeks' work, when the delimitation had reached the second and third of the four belts of cultivated land lying between the Hari Rud and the Murghab Rivers, discussions began to arise. The gist of them all was mainly the possession and control of the headwaters of the various canals by means of which alone these tracts are fertilised. Mutual concessions were made, though in the end there is no doubt that the Russians proved the gainers in getting a continuous chain of habitable stations across the otherwise impassable desert. The most difficult to settle of all these disputes was that on the Murghab itself, near Maruchak, where, on the usual canal pretext, the Russian members of the Commission insisted on a small tract being assigned to them on the right bank of the river, which was absolutely refused by the Afghan representatives, who saw the suitability of the river frontier. These matters were settled by the time the Commission went into winter quarters at Chahar-Shambah, and the boundary pillars were set up. In the spring, the work recommenced along the line from the Murghab to the Oxus, which had *previously* been surveyed wherever the severe winter had allowed of operations being conducted. The discussions between the two

ties grew more numerous as the end of the work approached, but it was evident at least to the British portion of the Commission that there was some method in the Russian obstruction, the object of which was to delay the conclusion of the demarcation. In spite of everything, however, the work went on as far as the station of Dukchi, twenty miles north of Andhikui, and twenty-five west of the Oxus. The heads of the water-courses, which were again in dispute along the whole route, were settled, as a rule, in favour of the Afghans, who could prove uninterrupted usage and possession. The object of the Russians, on the other hand, was, under pretext of obtaining possession of the sterile lands in occasional use by Turkomans from the north, to drive a wedge of their own territory between the two portions of Afghan-Turkestan, so as to prevent co-operation between them in case of an advance from the positions already secured by Russia in the north. Once at Dukhchi, however, the interminable discussion about the position of Khwajasalar began—a question which, arising from the discussion of untrustworthy maps of London and St. Petersburg, was finally relegated for settlement to the same authorities, after full topographical and historical details had been procured and furnished to their principals by both parties. The gist of this dispute seems to be as follows: at the diplomatic negotiations of 1873 the boundary of the tract which Russia is interested was fixed at “Khwaja-Salar, on the Oxus.” On arriving at the spot it was found by both surveyors, Russian and British, that there was no such place, but that it was a name given to a considerable tract lying along the river. This tract began at Khamiab, where the Commission halted. The sterile land along the stream from this point is said to have been the undisputed occupation of Afghan subjects for many years, a statement in which the Bokhára officials of the opposite bank appear to have concurred. The Russian contention was that the real spot meant in the protocol was a certain zîarat, or holy place, twenty-five miles up stream from Khamiab, and twelve miles above the important and much-frequented ferry of Kilif, which it thus commanded. There is this much foundation for the latter claim, that the zîarat in question is really known as that of Khwaja-Salar, though there is no evidence of the intention of the diplomatists who negotiated the agreement of 1873 to recognise it as a frontier station. To the Afghans it is of importance, as through it is commanded the direct route to Balkh from Russian territory. Before the final separation of the two portions of the Commission, it had been decided by the Russians to limit their claim to a triangle of about eight miles square, including, however, some of the best land in the disputed district, as well as the head-waters of three effective canals. The whole question, being abandoned by the Commission, was committed in detail for the decision of the Cabinets of the two nations, and the final pillars were erected as far as Dukhchi



only. An attempt seems to have been made at some period in the course of the delimitation to raise the question of the boundaries of Afghanistan in the direction of Badakshan, Wakhan, and Shignan, or the upper waters of the Oxus, regarding which the Russian Government has often during the last ten or more years raised doubts. It was not proposed, however, for reasons obvious to the British authorities, to continue the demarcation beyond the limits originally arranged. A small expedition was sent, however, entirely distinct from that over which Sir West Ridgeway presided, which advanced, under Colonel Lockhart, by Gilgit and Chitral into Badakshan. This adventure placed the Indian Government in possession of fairly complete surveys of the northern slopes and passes of the Hindu-Kush, an end to which the independent and courageous journey of the well-known traveller and political officer, Mr. Ney Elias, through Kashgar to Khanabad greatly contributed. The latter joined the International Commission at their winter quarters in Chahar-Shambah, whilst Colonel Lockhart, whose exploration took considerably longer, went back to India by way of Chitral.

As soon as the Khwaja-Salar question had been referred to the home Governments, and the British Commission had declined to enter upon any other, the latter left their summer quarters at Shadian, near the important town of Mazar-i-sheerif, on their way to Kabul, whither they went at the pressing invitation of the Amir. They crossed the Hindu-Kush by the Ghorband Pass, surveying and taking observations by the way, and made a short halt at Charikar, forty miles from Kabul. A deputation from the Amir then received them and conducted the whole party to a camp specially laid out for them near the city, which some of the Commission remembered only too well. The Amir himself received them in full durbar, held in their honour, and several entertainments were organised for them; and during their whole stay their treatment was of the most flattering and cordial description.

This review of their undertaking cannot close better than with the quotation of the Official Gazette specially issued on their arrival in British territory:—"On the return to India of the Afghan Boundary Commission, the Governor-General in Council desires to place on record his high appreciation of the valuable services rendered by officers and men during their two years' absence from British territory. Colonel Sir West Ridgeway and the political officers under his orders have shown skill, judgment, and tenacity in their endeavours to secure the primary objects of the Commission, and the results obtained in other departments have been highly satisfactory; while the military escort, composed of detachments of the 11th Bengal Lancers and 20th Punjab Infantry, have upheld throughout, by discipline, endurance, and good conduct, the credit of her Majesty's army.

Governor-General in Council heartily congratulates the members of the Commission upon the completion of their trying, and welcomes them back to the British frontier."

#### CENTRAL ASIA AND AFGHANISTAN.

scarcely any events worthy of special note seem to have occurred during the year in Central Asia, except a disastrous one at Merv, due to the bursting of a dam recently erected close to the town. Similarly, a bridge across the Tajand for the line of the railway burst during the heavy floods in May, submerging a considerable length of line. The accident was attributed to faulty construction of the work, of which the piers were too close together for the nature of the stream. Considerable progress was said to be made with the Central Asian railway, and trains were reported to have run into Merv, but from other accounts it appears that for a good portion of the line last laid the way is only surface-laid, and inadequate to bear any heavy traffic, for commercial purposes. On the part of Afghanistan, the refusal of the renewal of the "ethnographic" claim of Russia over the Turkomans induced a general policy of extrusion of the tribes, who had taken up their temporary abode within the dominions of the Amir, south of the Zulfikar-Maruchak frontier, to their relegation to Panjdeh, from the north of which they come. This course is said to be calculated to lead to difficulties in that valley, which affords means of subsistence for a smaller number of families than has now entered it. On the other hand, the settlement of the Maruchak district enabled the Governor of Herat to send back thither the families of his own subjects who had left whilst the question of proprietary rights was in dispute. The explorations of Mr. Griesbach, the geologist attached to the Boundary Commission, showed that the mountainous districts of Kabul contain large and apparently easily worked coal-fields, of excellent quality.

In Afghanistan itself there is still less of moment to record. The health of Abdul Rahman was not good, on the whole, though the outbreak from which he suffered was not of the serious nature which the newsmongers of the frontier bazaars wished to make it to be. The death of the Amir was rumoured as usual more than once, owing to the known uncertainty existing as to his successor, and the troubles that were reported to be likely to arise in the attempt to maintain a son of the present ruler on the throne. In the tract around the capital there was a scarcity of grain during the middle of the year, but other food was luckily in abundance, and the distress did not degenerate into actual famine. The most important political event of the season was the rising of two large and powerful sections of the Ghilzais, the *Abdullahi* and *Ghazni*. The cause of the outbreak is not yet accurately known, but it has been variously

attributed to heavy taxation, to the admission of the British on terms of friendship, and to the political intrigues of the sons of the well-known religious leader, Mushk-i-Alam, who took a leading part in the anti-British rising of 1879–80. There is no doubt that his sons were in the van of the outbreak, and that they were aided by the freebooter Sadu, but the rising does not seem to have extended beyond the vicinity of Ghazni and into the Lughman valley. In the latter it was quelled without much difficulty, but in the country between Ghazni and Kandahar it smouldered for some time, and the trade route was temporarily barred. A rumour got about that the Durrani were prepared to join the insurgents, but this seems to have been untrue, or at least their aid was not openly placed in the field. The rising was put an end to by the Amir's chief general, Gholam Hydar, himself a member of one of the unruly tribes. He is stated to have obtained access to Ghazni by a false oath regarding the object of his mission, and then to have turned upon the garrison and massacred them. Other accounts state that he suffered a defeat before his triumph, but all accounts agree in the fact of several cartloads of rebel heads having been forwarded to the Amir in the end, and trade seems to have been re-established by the end of the year.

*The North-West Frontier.*—The year opened with the prospect of an expedition of the usual sort, small at first, but growing as operations developed themselves, against the Bonerwals, a tribe which had been raiding on their neighbours, and had gathered a force on the British frontier. The party of Guides sent against them attacked the place of gathering and carried it, but with sufficient loss to make it advisable to take further steps against the encroachers. An expedition of 9,000 men was organised, accordingly, under Sir Charles Macgregor; but before it started the tribes entered into negotiations for submission.

The only other raids of any magnitude were made, one by the Mahsudi Waziris, who had been quiet ever since the lesson that followed their raid on Tonk in 1881, and another by the Shiránis, a tribe near Dera. In Baluchistan some trouble was given by the son of the Jam of Lus Bela, who escaped from the surveillance under which he had been placed near Sibi, and got together a following from amongst the Mingal Brahuis, with whom he fled into the desert, whither it was found impracticable to pursue him. As regards British affairs on this frontier, the Bori station, in the valley found practicable as an alternative route towards Kandahar from the Derajat, was prepared for the location of a permanent cantonment of a few companies. The Commander-in-Chief, Sir F. S. Roberts, visited, with a staff of experts, all this neighbourhood, and selected sites for intrenched camps, and other works, in the Khojak and Pishin valleys, and passed through Quettah on his way back to India.

*The Northern Frontier.*—Here the only event of importance

was the preparation for a commercial mission to Lhasa, in pursuance of an agreement entered into with China at Peking, and subsequently incorporated into the definite treaty made regarding the Burmah frontier. The mission took several months in preparation, and was collected ready for starting at Darjiling; but at the last moment it was notified from China, and it was also made pretty clear by the Tibetan authorities, that such an advance would be unwelcome at Lhasa, and would possibly be opposed on the route by the jealousy of the Lamas. Whatever the motive, it resulted in the occupation by Tibetan forces of a portion of the road that lies within Sikkim territory, and in the closing of the Jelap-la pass, and also in the advance of some troops to the Ling-ta pass within ten miles of the British frontier, and the mission was finally given up.

### BURMAH.

The end of the year 1885 was marked by the occupation, almost without resistance, of Bhamo, which was found much injured by the raids of the Kachyins from the north and east. Up the Chindwin River four of the agents employed by the Bombay-Burmah Trading Company were captured whilst at work in the forests, and murdered by dacoits within twenty miles of Mandalay. An expedition to Kendat was undertaken from the direction of Manipur, as the local woon, or governor, who had shown himself friendly to the English, had been imprisoned by a faction risen up against him. He was released after the town where he was imprisoned had been shelled, but matters were far from quiet in that direction for many months afterwards. In Mandalay the royal refugees were taken to Rangoon, whither the Tinedah, one of the officers supposed to have instigated much of the misconduct attributed to Theebaw, was soon after transferred. As it was impolitic to keep so many state prisoners in Burmah itself, the Tinedah, who appeared the most likely to intrigue, was deported to Calcutta, whence, after an interview with the Viceroy, he was finally taken to Cuttack, as a safe place of detention. At this time there were no less than three pretenders to the throne in the field against the British. All had nominated ministers and local governors, and all were doing their best to levy all the taxes that the fear or credulity of the villagers could persuade them to pay. The pretender nearest to Mandalay was Myinsaing. In the neighbourhood of Mingyan were the Chaungwa princes, and in the north-west Maunghwat. In addition to these were the leaders of large and well-organised bands of dacoits, such as Hla-Oo and Bo-Shwe, men who had been outlaws in the time of Theebaw, and made use of the unsettled state of the country to extend their sphere of operations and add a political colour to their exactions. Nor was the dacoit movement confined to the newly conquered territory, for it soon spread to lower Burmah,

so that by the end of the first quarter of the year there was hardly a district, except in the Karen territory, that had not been distinguished by one or more raids. It was alleged that the villagers often made up bands of their own for plundering excursions; that the disbanded soldiers of Theebaw's army had collected into organised bodies for the same purpose, and that the Phongyes, or Buddhist priests, were at the bottom of most of the troubles in the lower province. In Bassein the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. St. Barbe, who had been a member of the former mission to Burmah in 1879, was killed by a band of dacoits in ambush, as he landed on the coast. Two more civil officials of rank were also killed during the year in much the same way—Mr. Phayre, a name well remembered in Burmese annals, and Mr. Gleeson, a young officer only recently sent to the country from the Bombay Presidency. In fact, one of the most deplorable features of the year's operations is the large proportion of European officers, both civil and military, whose lives were sacrificed in the forest warfare that was carried on almost incessantly throughout the twelvemonth.

Outside Burmah itself there was but little intrigue. The Meingun prince left his refuge in Pondicherry for Colombo, with the intention of getting on board a French steamer for Saigon, and from that point of vantage of fishing for himself in the troubled waters of his native land, but finding that to do so he would have to trust himself to a port boat, belonging to the British, he returned, *re infecta*, to Pondicherry. King Theebaw, after some stay in Madras, was transferred to a safer place of detention, Ratnagiri, on the west of India being selected. The Viceroy landed in Rangoon on February 6, and proceeded to Mandalay. Here he arranged a preliminary scheme for the administration of the newly acquired territories, the main features of which were, first, the conjunction of Upper and Lower Burmah into a Chief Commissionership, under Sir C. Bernard, in direct communication with the Viceroy himself; secondly, the retention of the military authority in the hands of the Commander-in-Chief of India; and, thirdly, the reinforcement of the local police by levies from the Panjab and the North-West Provinces. He also held interviews with the head of the Buddhist priests, and assured him that the policy of the British was one of toleration, and that the free exercise of the Buddhist religion would be allowed to all, according to the present system. In accordance with the first part of the programme, a Bill was introduced later in the year for the settlement of the extent to which the laws of British India should be made current in Burmah, beyond the former frontier. Considerable levies of the warlike races of the north, Goorkhas excepted, were brought to Burmah in the course of the season, with good effect. It was also found feasible to arm a portion of the Karens, a race which had always shown itself faithful to the British, and to employ



them in the forests, to which they were accustomed, in tracking down and capturing gangs of fugitive dacoits. The policy towards the Shans of the frontier districts was announced to be one of protection, their own chiefs remaining in power as long as they showed themselves able to keep up their authority in preserving order and in preventing raiding on foreign territory. The Chief Commissioner proclaimed an amnesty to all except those concerned in the murder of the four Europeans up the Chindwin. In spite of all precautions and promises, the number of dacoities increased, and the state of Lower Burmah became so unsettled that drafts of men had to be sent for from Madras and Bombay to patrol the country and keep down the constantly recurring attacks upon settled villages. The military force was divided at first into two, subsequently into four, and by the end of October into six brigades, containing altogether more than 30,000 men of all arms. The nature of the country afforded every facility to the dacoits, who were, moreover, better served by their spies than any foreigner could expect to be. The usual proceeding was to begin with a rush into the village, and set it on fire. In the confusion a search was made for property, and still more closely for arms. By the time the alarm was given to the troops outside the assailants had made good their escape to the depths of the forest. In addition to these raids there were the continual ambushes into which small bodies of troops were led, either from ignorance or treachery. The stands made at stockaded positions were also not unfrequent, but after a short experience of the effect of mountain guns and of cavalry or mounted infantry in pursuit these affairs became rarer. In many cases the bodies of dacoits were of considerable strength, and the losses suffered were proportionately numerous, though the total was seldom ascertained, owing to the skill of the dacoits in carrying off or concealing their dead and wounded. The uncertainty of the enemy's whereabouts, the continual firing from forest cover, where pursuit was useless, added to the hardships of the route and often the unhealthiness of the climate, rendered the position of the regular troops a very trying one. The number of outposts was, for the greater part of the year, about forty beyond the original frontier, but troops were only concentrated in any considerable numbers in Mandalay. Afterwards, when more troops had been sent from India, Ningyan, Bhamo, and Kendat were reinforced, and expeditions in force were taken thence to the surrounding country. On several occasions the camps of the pretenders or the leading dacoits were actually surprised, but in every instance the chief man managed to escape, though on two occasions at least he was wounded, and on one, that of the Myinsaing prince, the wounds seem to have resulted in subsequent death. As a rule, the death of the leader was followed by the *immediate* dispersal of the gang, and the cessation of *depredations in the neighbourhood*. This was especially the

case towards the end of the year, when the use of cavalry had become more general. Several of the dacoits of the second rank in reputation voluntarily surrendered, but two or three of the more redoubted still remained at large. The visit of Sir F. Roberts, on the lamented death of Sir H. Macpherson from fever, was attended with modifications of the system of hunting down the main gangs, which seem to have helped towards this result. At the same time the Commander-in-Chief set down his opinion very clearly as to the serious need of the continuance of a large and efficient force for some time to come, together with a supplementary body of semi-military police, recruited from Northern India, as before, to replace the native levies, which, except in a few signal instances, were found to be cowardly, if not otherwise unworthy of confidence. As regards the extreme north, the difficulties anticipated with China with reference to the definition of her authority over the wild tribes on the Yunan border were satisfactorily settled by the agreement to a Boundary Commission, which would undertake the work at a future date. The continuance of the decennial mission, bearing tribute, was also agreed to by Britain, on the understanding that only native Burmese should be expected to wait on the Emperor at Pekin. Both Powers agreed to foster trade with each other's adjacent territories, and to abstain from heavy or prohibitory duties being imposed by frontier officials. The Kachyins, a tribe always expected to give trouble in the direction of Bhamo, kept fairly quiet throughout the year, save in the case of one Tsabaw (chief), who raided on a village only twelve miles from Bhamo. A punitive expedition was sent to Kotraun, the chief village of the chief, but before it arrived the latter made submissive advances, which were accepted with the more readiness since the expedition had found the route so much more arduous than they expected that they had taken more time over it than their commissariat warranted. On their way back, too, they were fired on by independent bodies of mountaineers almost up to their own boundary. It was satisfactory, however, that shortly afterwards a few of this race, having come into Bhamo and accepted work on the roads and other undertakings in progress, were so pleased by the remuneration they got that they returned to bring back more of their fellow-tribesmen to share in the new source of gain, and gave no further trouble.

On the Chindwin it was determined to establish a garrison beyond Kendat, so an expedition was sent off in April from Mirgan. The only really severe fighting met with was in an attack on a fortified stockade, from which the enemy retreated, on being shelled, to a second stockaded village, from which they had also to be driven, the fighting having lasted ten hours. Kendat, which had been apparently reoccupied by the rebels, was taken after slight resistance early in June. An advance was made to Tammu, during which hard fighting took place one day, but with

out stopping the progress of the expedition. A short experience, however, showed that Tammu was unhealthy, so a position was occupied farther towards the Manipur frontier, about twenty miles from the former place. From this point an expedition was made for fifty miles up the Chindwin, without any result of moment.

The ruby mines of Momeit, which have been invested for years with the glamour of ignorance, were naturally the subject of some discussion on the occupation of the country. It was at first rumoured that they had been leased on unknown terms to a syndicate, headed by Mr. Streeter, the celebrated authority on gems, but financed by some French speculators. There seems to have been no foundation for this rumour, which died out as it became known that the mines themselves had been found by no means easy of approach. In fact, it was some months before men could be spared to escort an expedition for their exploration, and, after such an undertaking had been actually embarked upon, the first stage only had been reached by the end of the year. The troops occupied the large village of Tsagadaung, at the foot of the range, without opposition, and up to the close of the year the hill Shans had abstained from making any attack.

The town of Mandalay was the scene of two serious misfortunes during the year. Incendiaries, probably belonging to one of the political parties attached to the pretenders, fired the town in several places simultaneously, in the expectation of being supported in the confusion by a rising of the inhabitants against the British. The guards were, however, too well placed to allow of a surprise of this sort, though before the fires were got under much damage had been done to the public buildings occupied by officials. The second calamity was the bursting of a large dam built by the late rulers for the protection of the town against floods, or for purposes of defence, as the case might be. This was under the supervision of the British officers, but, owing to some laxity, or want of appreciation of the strength of the flood, which was the highest that had taken place for eight years, a breach was suddenly made by the rising waters, and a portion of the town in which were large numbers of warehouses of grain and clothing material was completely swept away. The waters were partially diverted by cutting another breach, in a dam below the town, so as to let out a portion of the flood, but the loss of property was very great. The food-supply ran short, too, and considerable distress followed, which had to be met by public relief in the shape of doles of grain, and the establishment of gangs of labourers on the repair of different works in or near the city.

The administration of the country cannot be said to have been conducted this year on the lines proposed for its permanent settlement, owing to the causes above mentioned. In spite of all difficulties, however, the revenue was collected to a considerable amount, and the mass of the people seemed to be disposed to dwell contentedly under the new régime, as soon as the latter

proved itself strong enough to protect them from the resentment of the predatory and political freebooters who paid so many visits to their domiciles.

### INDIA.

Before entering upon the consideration of home affairs in the Empire, there are a few events to recount amongst the feudatories. The year was singularly fatal to the ruling chiefs, Gwalior, Indore, and Manipur having all passed into the hands of new administrators. Sindia and Holkar were both well known as foremost in the ranks of native chiefs, the one as a military potentate, the other for his keen business aptitudes and the care with which he improved and nursed the finances of his State. Both died nearly at the same time—namely, on June 17 and 20 respectively. They were succeeded by adopted sons, Holkar being of age, and Sindia a minor, aided by a Council of Regency, headed by the trusted minister of the late ruler. The death of Sindia followed but a few months on the accomplishment by Lord Dufferin of one of the main wishes of his life—the rendition of the fortress of Gwalior, which overlooked the very palace of the chief, and had been in the care of the British since 1857. In exchange Sindia ceded the Fort of Jhansi, situated in the midst of British territory, together with a few villages in the immediate vicinity of the fort, and a sum of money in compensation for the military works carried out at various times in the fort of Gwalior and cantonment of Morár. The advent to power of the new chief was signalised by the abolition of the transit duties in his State, at the request of the paramount Power. The same liberal policy was initiated by the ruler of Indore, as it had previously been by the Begum of Bhopal, whose State also passed from the hands of her husband into those of a British administrator, owing to the incapacity of the former. The question of transit dues had been long before the Government of India, as they weighed heavily upon the general trade of the countries served through the larger Native States, and the year under review turned out fruitful in the way of their abolition. Besides the States just named, several of the most important in the Bombay Presidency carried out the same reform. The prospects of the neighbouring lines of railway, especially the Indian Midland and the South Maratha, or West Deccan, were no doubt benefited by the liberation of traffic, but it has yet to be seen whether the treasuries of the different States concerned will not be replenished by devices perhaps more burdensome to the subjects thereof, though not felt, as the former ones, by foreigners.

The chief of Manipur, whose death was expected to give rise to some struggle for the succession, has been more than usually before the public of late, owing to the proximity of his State to

the Burmese frontier, and to various questions that have arisen from this neighbourhood. His forces operated to some extent with the British in keeping the north-west of Burmah quiet, and a passage through his territory was given to troops marching towards the Chindwin from Assam and Bengal. Possession of his throne was taken by his eldest son, but one of the younger ones soon afterwards, abandoning his post in the administration for the rôle of pretender, fled into the British district of Cachar, whence he emerged with a small following towards his brother's capital. He was met and easily driven back, and afterwards captured and placed in safety. The Regent of Kolhapur, only recently returned from a visit to England, died in March, and this State again fell into a long minority, the successor adopted being under twelve years old. The Maharaja of Kashmir, who succeeded last year, was installed with great pomp at Jammu, in May. Considerable reforms seem to have been begun in this State, but there were unfortunate dissensions, apparently, between the chief and his younger brothers, each being backed by a following amongst the officials, which hindered progress, and ended in a general shuffling of the high employés, the Bengalis being ousted in favour of natives of the country.

In Hyderabad the year began with a serious riot between Sikhs and Muhammadans at Aurangabad, which ended in several persons being killed. Due inquiries seem to have been made, and the Sikhs, who were in fault, punished. The want of accord between the young chief and his young minister, Nawáb Sálár Jang, had become a matter of notoriety, of which the nobles, always in faction, took advantage. It was partly to arrange this difficulty, which threatened the whole administrative fabric, that the Viceroy paid a formal visit to Hyderabad in November, after one of his Council, who had been formerly Resident, had failed to repair the breach, on a special mission he undertook for the purpose. It is believed that the diplomacy of Lord Dufferin was successful in establishing more cordial relations between the two young men, though some changes had to be made in the *personnel* of the administration.

The state of affairs in Nipal continued much as before. The fugitive sons of Jang Bahadur remained safe in British territory, with one exception, General Amar Jang, who was caught in the forests on his way to the frontier. The enlistment of the new recruits for the strengthening of the Goorkha regiments in the British army was at first conducted by the Nipal authorities with small success, as a good many of the so-called volunteers deserted very soon after they had been drafted into the different corps. It was therefore arranged, after some negotiations, that recruiting parties from the regiments themselves should be admitted for the purpose.

*The Army.*—In the cold weather at the beginning of the year *one of the largest review gatherings of troops that has been seen*



in India took place near Delhi. About 35,000 men were divided into two armies, one attacking and the other protecting the approach to that city. The display took place in the presence of most of the high officials, and of a company of foreign military delegates specially invited to witness the manœuvres. Though somewhat spoiled by wet weather, the operations on the whole were said to have been satisfactory. Amongst the other events of the year may be noted the transfer to the command of the Commander-in-Chief of the "Panjab Frontier Force," comprising what were formerly called the Sikh local regiments and the Guides. The system of linked battalions was also introduced late in the season, and some additions made to the mountain batteries found so useful in both Afghanistan and Burmah. The changes in the *personnel* of the military command and administration must also be mentioned. Sir F. Roberts, Commander-in-Chief of India, arranged at first for the command of the Burmese operations to be taken by Sir Herbert Macpherson, the recently appointed Commander-in-Chief of Madras. On the lamented death of this distinguished officer from fever, in October, Sir F. Roberts himself took command, as has been stated above. The chief command of Madras was given to Sir Charles Arbuthnot, then in command at Bombay, whilst H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught left his divisional charge of Rawalpindi, which he had but just joined, for the command of the Western Presidency. In the Viceregal Council two deaths occurred. General Wilson, military member, died at the end of February, and was succeeded by General Hughes, who died three months later. The vacancy was filled by General George Chesney, then Military Secretary to the Government of India.

*Legislation.*—The year was one more of promise than of performance. Of the important Bills introduced, perhaps that of most general application was the new Bankruptcy Act, prepared by the skilled hand of Mr. Ilbert, who helped to draft the English Act on the same subject. The importance of the measure led to its publication in a draft form for the opinion of the legal and commercial public, so that it was left at the end of the year still only in embryo. The same may be said of the two Bills regarding tenancies in Oudh and in the Panjab. The Bill regulating the amount of legislation suitable to the present condition of Upper Burmah has been already mentioned. A short Act providing for the appointment of magistrates as judges in cases of dacoity was passed for British Burmah, in order to relieve the gaols of that province of the number of captured gangs of dacoits awaiting trial by the Sessions Courts, before whom alone such offences are ordinarily triable. A curious bit of legislation may be mentioned in connection with the Karens, a tribe already stated above to be found of signal loyalty against the dacoits. It appears that this race were being gradually dispossessed of their ancestral land by Burmese money-lenders, who were all

introducing large numbers of settlers of their own race into the villages of the Karens. On political grounds it was found desirable to protect the ignorant villagers against the acute usurer, so the Bill in question provided for the dispossession of strangers from village lands belonging to the Karens. A similar provision was formerly found advisable in the case of the inhabitants of the Garo Hills. Another example of special legislation is to be found in the so-called Ghee Act, passed hastily for the lower provinces of Bengal, for the prevention of the adulteration of clarified butter, a product which is used in cooking by all Hindus. The admixture of animal substances had, it was alleged, been carried to such a pitch that it was rarely that pure ghee could be obtained. Strictly speaking, the consumption of such a defiled compound entails loss of caste to all who partake of it, but the universality of the adulteration probably prevented the development of the panic it was sought to excite. In other provinces, to which the Government of India was inclined to ask for the extension of the measure, the local authorities, acting on native opinion, deprecatd interference. In November Mr. Ilbert retired from the post of Legislative Member of Council, to take up a parliamentary legal office in England, and his place was taken by Mr. Leoble, Q.C., formerly Advocate-General of Bombay. A Legislative Council, on the model of that in Bengal, was established in December for the North-West Provinces.

*Public Works.*—The express recommendations of the Parliamentary Committee of 1884, and the advantage to the export trade of the extension of railway communication, gave considerable impetus to this class of enterprise during the year. The first section of the Indian Midland line, between Kalpi and Jawnpore, was opened by the end of March. The Bombay-Jaroda, with the Rajputana-Malwa, took over the Achneira-Jawnpore line, so as to bring the great wheat mart into direct communication with Ahmadabad and Bombay. The South Maratha Company obtained a concession for a term of years of the Mysore system, which they are to complete, and part of the payment was made over in liquidation of the debt to the British Government by that State. By the end of November 188 lakhs of rupees had been sanctioned for the Bellary-Kistna line, and the Nizam's line to the north and east of His Highness's dominions was in full work, with the southern extension well in hand. The Bolan temporary line was carried into Quettah towards the end of July, and progress was made in spite of heavy loads with the Harnai route. The Sind-Sagar military line has already received mention above. Local coal-supply, to which is due a good deal of the profit of the East India line, was made the subject of much investigation during the year. The branch line from Katna to the Umeria fields, in the Riwah State, was opened in June. An examination of the Salt Hills in the Panab showed that there was a fair prospect of profitable mining

in nearly every section of that range, and that the coal could be used as mined, without being first converted, as had been feared, into patent fuel.

Petroleum was found plentiful near Sibi, but being forty miles from the station it was not so much utilised for the locomotives as it is intended to be in future. The workshops of the North-Western railway at Sakkar on the Indus have been for some time successfully driving engines with this oil as fuel. The only severe damage done to railways this year was in the south, where a cyclone and heavy flood washed away part of the Madras line, and stopped communication for a few days, and in the north near Saharanpore, where similar interruption took place.

*Finance.*—In the opening of this review it was stated that the absorbing difficulty of the administration this year was the restoration of equilibrium in the financial position, which had been, and was likely still for some time to be, disturbed by the fall in the price of silver as compared with gold; or, what is to Indian finance almost the same thing, by the gradually rising appreciation of gold in the European and foreign market generally. It is not necessary to point out here the relations between India and the home country in questions of finance, but it will suffice to mention, amongst the main items which the former has to remit to the latter, the charges on account of the British troops, the interest on the sums invested by England in Indian securities and public works, and the payment for stores and material brought out from Europe because they are unattainable on the spot. There are also the comparatively small charges on account of salaries and pensions to be liquidated.

The most prominent of these in the discussions of this year has been the first, or military expenses. The approach of Russia to the north-western frontier rendered it necessary, in the opinion of all the various political parties in England, to develop the system of frontier defence in that direction. The British garrison was strengthened, and strategical lines of railway laid out. The fortifications of existing places of arms were extended, and new ones undertaken. The defences of the coast also received attention. In the midst of all this activity there occurred the expedition to Upper Burmah, which developed into a series of lengthy and expensive operations.

The rupee began a rapid and steady fall in 1885, so that it was apparent, by the time the estimates for 1885-86 were revised in December of that year, that the finances would have to be supported by additional taxation. In January, accordingly, Sir Auckland Colvin, the financial member of the Viceroyal Council, made what was practically his financial statement, such as is usually reserved until the Budget of the coming year is in question. The occasion was the introduction of a fiscal measure, which alone necessitates the submission of the financial affairs of the country to the Legislative, instead of to the Execu-

five, Council. He pointed out that the great reforms of the financial arrangements made in 1882–83 by Sir E. Baring had been followed by three years of great prosperity, so that the remission of taxation to the amount of three millions a year was accompanied by a surplus of practically 700,000*l.* every March. This state of things seemed likely to continue, for the main causes to which the prosperity was due—namely, the expansion of railway profits, the increased consumption of salt, and the rise of trade prospects all round—were still in operation. But the fall of one penny in the rupee value of silver meant the provision of one crore (100 lakhs) of rupees in the estimates over and above that of the previous year. Added to this were the increased charges on account of military works and arrangements on the frontiers. The finances were, however, still so sound that the ordinary revenue sufficed for all but about 700,000*l.*, including the balance of half a million sterling which prudence required to remain over the actual estimate of needs. Three modes of raising this sum offered themselves to the Government. In the first place, a demand might be made on the provincial contracts, which had been so well administered that a considerable surplus was left in the hands of the local Governments. But the finance member pointed out that to dip into this balance a year before the contract would come under revision was to establish a feeling of distrust and uncertainty, which would probably react upon the administration of the next term, for which arrangements were to be made in 1887–88. The second mode of raising the wind was by indirect taxation. The salt duties might be raised to the rate current before the remissions of 1882; but, though such a procedure had been provided for by the then Government, it was obviously unjust to inflict a burden unnecessarily on the lowest classes whilst any means of taxing those above, and less oppressed, remained untried. To reimpose import duties on foreign cloth and cotton goods entailed the imposition of an excise of some sort on the produce of the local mills, which would be unprofitable. It must be mentioned, however, that this scheme, apart from the excise detail, received great support throughout the native community and from some of the leading Anglo-Indian journals. The third and last resource was direct taxation, for which a basis was already found in the licence tax. The richer would thus be reached, and by extending the provisions of the existing Acts to professional and official incomes the stigma of partiality would be removed. The Bill then introduced was referred to a Select Committee, and became law in a few weeks. The classes newly brought into the financial net were, as might be expected, loud in their protests, especially the European officials and others living on salaries, who suffered in like degree with the Government from the fall in exchange. The abuses under the old Acts, caused by the employment of temporary and irresponsible agents for the

assessment, were got over by a provision that the only persons to be so utilised on this occasion were the experienced servants of Government. The great shortcoming in the measure, as in that of previous years, was the comparative paucity of incomes assessed, owing partly, no doubt, to the absolute want of information about the incomes of the better classes of natives, to whom secrecy on this matter is almost a point of honour. As regards the incidence on the tax-payer, the Bill aimed at a general rate of 2 per cent. on the incomes of less than 2,000 Rs. per annum, and was actually below this on those of 1,250 Rs., and at a rate of five pies per rupee on incomes above 2,000 Rs., or about 2·60 per cent. The estimated yield was 620,000*l.* over and above that of the licence tax. During the year the working of the Act gave rise to little or no disturbance, and only in one instance (Trichinopoli) was there any attempt at shutting shops and other customary signs of protest.

The exhaustive debates and expositions that accompanied the introduction of this Act took away much of the interest of the Budget, which followed it at a few months' interval. The course of silver showed no signs of permanent diversion upwards, whilst the debates in the American House of Representatives on the so-called Bland Act, though resulting in the temporary victory of the silver party, raised strong apprehensions of a further resistance on the part of the opposition, with whom the sympathies of the President were known to lie. A despatch on the question was sent to the Secretary of State in February, calling the attention of the Treasury authorities in England to the serious disturbance of the finances of India caused by the present state of monetisation in Europe as well as America, and expressing hopes that some proposals would be made by England for a conference on the subject, and the subsequent adoption of some means for the establishment of a more stable relationship between the two precious metals. The reply of the Treasury was in the negative, and seemed to treat the matter with a want of consideration and inquiry that the Government of India failed to appreciate. An exhaustive Note was accordingly prepared in the financial secretariat of Calcutta, showing pretty conclusively the fallacy of attributing the great expansiveness of the export trade of India to the fall in silver prices of late years, so that in this way the alleged benefit of low exchange to the country was not proven. The advance of India in trade was shown to be due partly to her own action in improving communications and facilities of transport, partly to fall in freights, and still more to the fall in prices of imported goods having been partially counteracted by the advantage reaped by the low exchange. It was also shown that the trade of India in exported produce had not been especially active or profitable at the time of lowest exchange, and in fact that the state of exchange was but one amongst many factors in the question. Later in the year the



clusions in this Note were adopted in great measure by the Government, and sent for the consideration of the Treasury.

The despatch showed a strong leaning towards what is now known as "bimetallism," which had been for some time actively supported by their Secretary of Finance. Some encouragement to these views was afforded by the attitude of the *Times* newspaper, which abandoned its former views of the advantages of monometallism, in favour of at least a fair inquiry being made as to the possibilities of the rehabilitation of silver.

The Budget itself contained two novelties. One, the abandonment of the fiction of 10 Rs. being the equivalent of 1l., a state of finance long passed away. The second, the remodelling of the accounts of railways and other public works in accordance with the suggestions of the Parliamentary Committee of 1884.

The accounts of the year ending with March 1885 showed a deficit amounting to nearly 400,000l., of which about 250,000l.

was due to changes in the system of accounts only, leaving a balance in hand which, considering the large totals of revenue and expenditure, amounts practically to equilibrium. The year 1885-86 was estimated to close with a deficit of nearly three millions sterling, a result due almost entirely to the military and political exigencies of the past year. Sir A. Colvin pointed out that had it not been for these untoward events, the complications of the north-west, and the expedition to Burmah, the results of the year would have been a surplus of 4,000,000l. The estimates worked out very near the actuals, the increase being in the returns from railways, and, on the other side, the losses on remittances to England.

The estimates for 1886-87 provided a small surplus of 200l.; but, to quote the words of the finance member, "the uncertainty with respect to silver entirely neutralises the most carefully formed forecasts of the future, and renders the task of budget-making in India almost illusory." The whole work is described as experimental. The main features were the large increase of assignments for the army and for military works, as, for the loss by exchange. The revenue from railways and opium was expected to increase, whilst there was a decrease in the capital cost of the former. The revenue from Burmah was taken at about 84,000l. below the expenditure in that province, owing to the large sum (300,000l.) for the army of occupation. The income-tax was estimated to yield 765,000l., instead of 620,000l. The yield of opium was anticipated to be above the average, but the success of the sales of the produce is likely to depend a good deal upon the working of the new convention with China, which came into operation for the first time in 1886-87. If the executive there have been able to prevent the loss of local transit duties—as is implied in the provisions regarding

Li-kin—paid at the treaty ports, the sales are likely to exceed those of the previous year. The large increase in the

military charges, amounting to 160,300*l.* in England and 1,12,69,000 Rs. in India, is on account, for the most part, of regimental, commissariat, volunteer, and pension dues. In England the small increase is mostly set down to additional troops in India and stores. The assignments for protective works and the reduction of debt were 1,500,000*l.*, as usual, though only 1,363,000*l.* was entered under this head, owing to the apportionment of the balance to the payment of the interest on the capital guaranteed for the Indian Midland Railway Company. The Budget statement entered into the question of the application of the so-called famine grant, and showed how the interest charges had been reduced by over 940,000*l.* since the system was introduced by Sir J. Strachey. As regards the revenue from the monopoly of salt, there is no doubt that the increased consumption of the present year was not in the same ratio as it had been for the last three seasons. It may be that the trade is subject to oscillations, as in the case of less necessary articles of consumption ; but the falling off received serious comment from the financial authorities, since the reduction of the duty in 1882 was justified by the anticipation of a large increase in the amount of salt paying that duty. Lastly, among the minor subjects dealt with in the statement, may be noted the increase of the depositors in savings banks, both district and, still more, of Post-office institutions. The success of the latter during the first year of trial induced the Government to extend their operation to the exclusion of the former. The fact is worthy of comment, as indicating the prosperity of the investing classes in the midst of the difficulties arising from the foreign relations of the country.

The necessity for the utmost economy in the financial administration was the cause of the institution in March of a finance committee by the Government of India. The committee comprised both Europeans and natives, official and non-official. They went from province to province, minutely examining the several departments of the administration, and proposing reductions, or amalgamations of appointments. Their labours lasted until December, and even then their final report had not been reviewed by the Supreme Government. One of their chief tasks was to review the provincial contracts, and, as far as could be justly done, to secure better terms on the ensuing readjustment for the Imperial Treasury. It was generally believed that their work had been accomplished efficiently, and without prejudice to the local administrations, beyond the inconveniences inevitable to every curtailment of revenue. It may perhaps be noted that the aggregate pay of the members of the committee, who, as far as the officials were concerned, were of high station, amounted to over 1,000 Rs. per diem.

*Miscellaneous.*—The coincidence in dates between the Hindu festival of the Dussera and the Muhammadan commemoration of the Muharram gave rise again, as last year, to riots between

the two races in some of the larger towns of the North. The most serious took place at Etawah and Delhi. In the former the Muhammadans were undoubtedly the aggressors, and showed so strong a desire for a collision that before they were dispersed some troops, that had luckily been stopped at the station whilst passing, had to charge them with bayonets. A large number were taken prisoners, and afterwards tried and convicted. In Delhi, again, the Muhammadans started the riot by organising a special and unauthorised procession at the time when the police had cleared the streets for the passage of the Hindus. The civil authorities were disregarded, and troops had to be employed. The next day the Hindus seem to have taken the initiative, and to have got access to the Jama Masjid, or chief Muhammadan place of worship, where they tied a slaughtered pig to the pulpit. The local troops were thought inadequate to cope with the riots that were expected, and more were ordered from Meerut, but for three days the town was the scene of continual street fighting. Trade was stopped, and much damage done. The riots were at last got under, but the illwill between the races continued to smoulder, and till the end of the year the Hindus were dismissing all their Muhammadan employés, and in other respects trying to injure those of the latter race. In Hoshiapur the riot began in the middle of an authorised procession of the Muhammadans. The origin is uncertain, but the cause of strife seems to have been the trespass of a sacred bull of the Hindus into the ranks of the procession. A man was killed on each side, but the subsequent trial showed that, whatever began the row, the continuation was due to the Muhammadans. A curious incident that occurred in the Muhammadan State of Tonk shows how little Western ideas have filtered through the capitals to the outlying districts. The Hindus of one of the villages transferred some time ago from Mhairwara to Tonk were assessed to land revenue, as they deemed wrongfully. They resorted, accordingly, to the old custom of johar, and burnt alive two of their women by way of protest. Such a sacrifice has not taken place for many years, though it was not uncommon in the wars between Rajputs and Muhammadans in the time of the early Moghul rulers. Public opinion in India was much exercised for a large portion of the year by certain administrative eccentricities in the Madras Presidency. Firstly, the amount of remissions in Tanjore, the wealthiest district in the South of India, attracted the notice of the Government, and, on special inquiry being made, it was discovered that a very large sum had been remitted on wrongful representations by the native revenue officials of all ranks, most of them being large landholders, and thus profiting by the concession. The affair was so well known that it is said no one but the European officials could have been ignorant of it. The collector was severely reprimanded; but the more serious part of the matter turned out to be the assertion by

the inquiring officer—one of the leading revenue officials in the Presidency—that in his opinion nearly one-fifth of the amount annually remitted by the Madras Government was based on false statements and returns made up by the subordinate officials, who were all landed proprietors. This question necessarily attracted the notice of the Secretary of State, and the local Government had the facts under consideration at the end of the year. Another affair that caused even more stir was an attack by some men on a senior officer of the revenue department in the same Presidency, whilst on a journey through the districts. The assault itself was comparatively a simple matter, but the case acquired great notoriety by the insinuation that the assault had been instigated by the late collector of the district through a local zemindar, and owed its origin to animosity conceived against the high officers of Government by reason of certain proceedings that had been taken against the said collector shortly before. It is unnecessary to enter here into all the details, but it will suffice to mention that the affair ended in a complete exposure of the system so long carried on by the higher officials in Madras, of land-jobbing in the Nilgiri Hills, and selling the land they had got cheap to others at a considerable profit, besides discreditable dealings of a similar nature. The shelter of the officials thus charged by the Government of which they were members, and the unnecessary severity with which they pursued the official who had brought these dealings to light, was made the subject of stricture by the Home Authorities, and the denouncing official was restored to the position of which he had been deprived by the local Government.

The annual departure of the officials with the Government to hill-stations, a system which gave rise to this scandal, was made the subject in Calcutta of a protest against the migration of the supreme Government to Simla and of the Bengal Government to Darjiling. As this has been for some years an annually recurring topic, the revelations from Madras gave it the stimulus which helped to keep it alive, and it resulted in a statement by the Government of India to the Secretary of State, of the total expenditure involved in this transfer of the seat of Government for eight months. Beyond this nothing was done.

The agitation against the practice of early marriages was carried on from Bombay to the rest of India. The opinions of local authorities, legal and official, were gathered, and Government at last gave a formal answer that legislation on the subject was neither desired nor desirable, the matter being one best left to societies most affected by the practice, reform following the recognition by these of the need for it.

The attempted return of Dhulip Singh from England to his native land was an event which caused a slight excitement, soon allayed. His approach to India was heralded by a sort of manifesto published in a Bombay journal, in which his aim was so

early set forth that the Government found no difficulty in having him detained at Aden. It appeared from this and other documents that he was in want of money, having exhausted the allowances and special grant made to him in England, and was about to enter the Punjab with the intention of setting up a claim to his paternal dominions. He threw off his English dress at Suez, and proclaimed himself a Sikh again. After a few weeks' detention at Aden he returned to France, leaving behind him a second proclamation, also published in a daily paper, in which he renounced the protection of England, adding a good deal of inflated and threatening matter, the gist being, as before, that he was pecuniarily at low water.

The general tone of the native press throughout India was much as usual, except at Bengal, where the virulent attacks upon the British Government and its administrators and measures came so marked as to call forth not only the reprobation of the press in other parts of the country, but even to elicit a dignified and significant protest from the Viceroy himself at a public meeting held in Poona during his tour over India. The tone of the press, with the above exception, was undoubtedly loyal, and, as a rule, appreciative of the events taking place in the country. The advent of the Royal Commander-in-Chief was greeted with great enthusiasm, and Lord Dufferin enjoyed cordial receptions and addresses throughout his long tour. The appointment of the Public Service Commission, which, as it only began its task in the middle of December, does not come within the scope of the present review, was a popular measure with the press, which largely recruited from the class which hopes ultimately to fill the civil appointments thrown open to natives of India only. On the financial difficulties of the year the public opinion, or the action of it, that is mirrored in the press, showed an almost universal want of appreciation of the situation, and the replies to the questions sent round and the proposals submitted by local associations and other bodies of natives were lamentably inadequate to aid the task of the Commission that called them forth. At the same time, it may be recorded amongst the experiences of the year that the progress of self-government in minor affairs, such as district boards and municipalities, was, except in Bengal, where the gap between the people and the educated man of the law is still too wide to be bridged, not discouraging, and gave rise to hopes that every year may transfer more of the responsibilities of administration from the official to the popular charge.

#### V. CHINA.

Early in the year General Courcy, whose command in Tonkin had been marked by a terrible massacre of native Christians, and the pacification of the Red River Delta, and by the growth of rebellion in *Annam*, was recalled by the French Government, and *M. Paul Bert*, a distinguished scientist, was appointed



Resident-General, to accomplish what experienced admirals and generals had failed to do. As he was a notorious and aggressive anti-clerical, and as the only real hold the French had obtained over the natives had been through their missionaries, his appointment raised an outcry of alarm, as unlikely to bring tranquillity to Tonquin. Before quitting France M. Bert, while acknowledging their many services in China and the East, said that "he would use the missionaries, not be used by them." He arrived without ceremony at Hué at the end of May with the problem before him of reducing to law and order a country given over to insurrection, and a people who for years had been living on rapine and bloodshed. He found North Tonquin comparatively quiet, but South Annam was in a state of complete anarchy, one province being entirely hostile to the French and another almost wholly occupied by the rebels. For some months there was more or less disorder, but the fighting was of an isolated character. The Governor of Cochin China placed troops at the disposal of M. Bert, and by September they were able to return to Saigon, having pacified the Binh Thuan and the Khan Hoa, expelled all rebels, and put friendly natives in the fortified places. Besides a constant tension between M. Bert and the military and naval authorities, his dread of the diffusion of European ideas among the natives did not stand the test of experience, and after eight months of wrangling and difficulty he fell a prey to dysentery. His ill-success in Tonquin, coupled with the deadly nature of the climate, made the selection of a successor difficult.

In consequence of renewed disturbances early in November the French occupied Cao-Bang and Auchan, strategic points in North Tonquin. The former, near the Chinese frontier, was within seven days' march from Thatkhe, the most advanced post in North-East Tonquin, and a Spanish missionary is believed to have been the only European who had previously visited it. Auchan, equidistant from Langson and Haiphong, was important for covering one of the delta roads. In the following month the French occupied Hai-Ning, on the Chinese frontier, a district infested by pirates; and two days later they took Monkai, where the Chinese-Franco Boundary Commission was shortly expected to meet. Tuong, who for many years played an important part in the administration of affairs in the kingdom of Annam, and became Regent during the recent war with France, died in captivity in October. After the unsuccessful night attack on General Courty at Hué in the previous year he had been exiled to the island of Tahiti, with an allowance of 30,000 francs per annum.

The French decree of Jan. 28 on the Tonquin and Annam Protectorate provided that those countries should have a distinct Budget, and that their connection with France should be maintained through a Resident at Hué, two chief subordinates and a number of high functionaries appointed by the Home Government.

he Resident would be invested with large powers, and on his ability would mainly depend the success of this laborious enterprise. He was further to stimulate the officials at Hué, so that the Annamite system might be utilised in Tonquin. Later on justice, education, and taxation would be supervised, but the progress was to be gradual, so as to avoid friction with native habits.

The negotiations between China and France for arranging the terms on which trade between the former country and Tonquin was to be conducted across the new frontier, and which had dragged slowly at Tientsin for nearly a year, were at last concluded, and reached Paris for ratification in July. Political questions having been settled, and the frontier delimitation referred to a joint Commission, it was hoped that the terms for regulating a still undeveloped trade would present few difficulties. The French, however, had entered on the negotiations with the idea that the result of the war entitled them to large concessions. Whilst the Chinese, knowing that France would not again lightly resume hostilities, seemed determined to show that, even in a commercial sense, France had gained nothing by the war. The result of the negotiations, therefore, proved that France had reaped none of the advantages she confidently expected, nor was England subjected to the disadvantages that were foretold, and which were to destroy her commercial predominance in South-West China.

The two most important articles of the Treaty (Nos. 6 and 7) provided that imports across the frontier into China were to pay one-fifth less than the maritime Customs dues, and exports one-third less. Goods not mentioned in the tariff were to pay 5 per cent. *ad valorem* in each case, and all such goods would pay the land transit dues in the usual way. By Art. 1 China agreed to open two places to trade, one on the frontier beyond Langson, the other above Laokai—the first giving access to the rich and populous province of Kwangsi, and the second to Yunnan. China would establish Customs stations at these two places, while France secured the right to appoint consuls to reside there. Art. 2 provided for the appointment of Chinese consuls in Hanoi, Haiphong, and other towns in Tonquin with favoured-nation treatment. By Art. 3 both sides engaged to assist their respective consuls in obtaining suitable residences; whilst Art. 4 provided for freedom of trade and residence for Chinese in Tonquin, and trade and residence under the usual conditions for the French in the open places in China. By Art. 5 only those persons armed with passports, to be granted by the Chinese Government, would be permitted to cross the frontier. Art. 14 provided for the total prohibition of the trade in opium between Tonquin and China. Art. 17 provided for the reciprocal extradition of criminals and deserters, and by Art. 18 the rules of the maritime Customs were made applicable to cases not specially dealt with in the treaty. It will, therefore, be seen that France

gained but one small concession, and that for the moment utterly valueless—viz. the reduction in import and export dues. Moreover, she failed in the two in which she was most anxious to succeed—viz. (1) to have the right of appointing an official Resident at Talifoo, or some other important centre in Yunnan, and (2) the right to impose a poll-tax on Chinese immigrants into Tonquin. Meanwhile the work of the Delimitation Commission advanced slowly, chiefly on account of divergences respecting North Tonquin.

An attempt by an influential German syndicate to obtain a commercial footing through the medium of the German Legation signally failed. Although armed with letters from Prince Bismarck, placing the whole diplomatic and consular influence of the German Empire at their service, the three gentlemen forming the mission failed even to obtain an audience with the Chinese authorities, who informed the German Minister that they were not in the habit of receiving merchants. An interview with Li Hung Chang was then sought, and he was invited to dine at the German Legation to meet the syndicate, but this he declined. Nor did the French engineers and contractors fare better when they established at Tientsin “*La mission industrielle de France en Chine.*” The Chinese stood altogether aloof, and testified no desire to follow any programme mapped out for them by self-interested foreigners. The dislike to foreign loans, strengthened by the urgent need of money, had led to a *régime* of severe economy and official honesty before unknown; whilst one of the more stable sources of revenue—that from Indian opium—also under the new treaty arrangement materially assisted the Chinese exchequer. On April 1, the Empress-Regent, the young Emperor and his father, Prince Chun, the “Seventh Prince,” with all the Court and an escort of 10,000 men left Peking on a pilgrimage to the royal tombs, about 100 miles east of the city. It is customary for the whole population to visit the graves of their families on the anniversary of “Tsing Ming,” and it was in honour of this that the royal family attended the tombs on April 5. After this ceremonial visit to the royal tombs, Prince Chun, as head of the recently constituted Marine Board, decided to emerge from the seclusion of the capital and inspect some of the northern seaports. During May he visited Tientsin and Port Arthur; at the former place he received the foreign consuls and the Commissioner of Customs, establishing friendly relations with all. Li Hung Chang’s disciplined troops were then reviewed, to the number of 15,000, horse, foot, and artillery, and the arsenals and forts inspected. On May 17 Prince Chun embarked for Port Arthur, escorted by the northern and southern squadrons, commanded by Captain Lang, and had an interview with Admiral Hamilton, in command of the British fleet, and attended by the captains of his ten ships. The Admiral returned the visit two days later at Chefoo, where the French Admiral, with

five ships under his command, was awaiting an audience with the Prince. In this tour the barrier to reasonable intercourse between the Imperial family and foreigners which had hitherto existed was finally broken down. It also greatly strengthened Li Hung Chang's position, for the Prince had seen enough to convince him that the coast defences were in competent and practical hands. It marked, moreover, another step towards the realisation of a national wish to possess an efficient navy. With this object Captain Lang, an Englishman who had previously rendered the country good service, was entrusted with the duty of providing an adequate force in five years, and was appointed to the responsible command of the northern squadron, with full powers to carry out the needful reforms. The four war vessels built for the government in Germany had turned out badly. Two of them were so ill-constructed that it was dangerous to fire their guns with a full charge, and they had to be strengthened at Shanghai, at great expense and at a critical moment, when the war with France was going on. The other two, built by the Vulcan Company at Stettin, under the superintendence of Li Fong Pao, the Chinese Minister at Berlin, gave such dissatisfaction that he was dismissed from the Imperial service, and barely escaped with his life.

In fiscal matters, also, reforms were inaugurated. A Commission, consisting of a British Consul, an officer of the Hong-Kong Government, and a Chinese official of equal rank, met at Hong Kong to arrange some system that would enable the Chinese to protect their revenue without prejudice to the interests of that colony. This Commission, sanctioned by the Chefoo Convention of 1876, arose out of the complaints of the Hong-Kong Government that the Canton Customs revenue cruisers interfered unduly with the junk trade of the colony. The proposal had lain dormant until revived by the Opium Convention of 1885, ratified in May of this year. On the one side it was said that Hong Kong was a nest of smugglers, and, on the other, that this free British port was blockaded by vessels of a foreign power. The Chinese proposed to establish a custom-house in Hong Kong, in order that all opium entering the port, no matter what its destination, should be kept in bond until it had paid the thirty taels tariff duty and eighty taels transit dues, upon which, when duly stamped, it might enter China. The effect of this would be: (1) to convert the free British port of Hong Kong to a Chinese Customs station; (2) to enable the Chinese to collect dues on opium which might be passing from one British colony to another, but would not enter China at all; and (3) to force residents in Hong Kong who might use the drug to pay the tax, thereby resulting in its being twice taxed, to the detriment of the consigner. To such proposals England obviously could not agree, and at the close of the year no settlement of the question had been reached. In the course of the year the Marquis Tseng,

after seven years' service as diplomatic representative of his country in England, France, and Russia, returned to China. His bearing during that period greatly increased his reputation among his countrymen, and he took back with him clear and definite views as to the policy which China should pursue in the future towards Great Britain. When he left, the relations between the two countries were on a better footing than they had been during fifty years' intercourse. His most recent achievement was the putting the opium trade on a basis satisfactory to his own country—a question that had long baffled the efforts of British statesmen.

On July 24 an Anglo-Chinese Convention was signed at Peking, by which the British Government made two distinct and important concessions to China. One was the recognition of the formal suzerainty of China in Burmah, by which Great Britain agreed to continue the customary decennial mission from the Burmese capital to Peking, the chief British official in Burmah taking the necessary steps for its despatch at the prescribed intervals, and the mission to convey specimens of Burmese produce. China, on the other hand, fully recognised the establishment of British rule in Upper Burmah, and, giving up her claim to Bhamo, bound herself to provide trade facilities between Burmah and Yunnan. A Commission was also arranged for defining the frontier, and the Chinese Government promised to promote the opening of trade between India and Thibet. The effect of this Convention, therefore, was that Great Britain made tangible and definite concessions in return for promises and vague assurances. The policy, however, of removing at any reasonable cost the misunderstanding which had arisen with regard to the suzerainty in Burmah was obvious if friendly relations between the two empires were to be maintained. The other concession to Chinese wishes was the abandonment of the British mission to Thibet at the solicitation of the Chinese Ministers, who anticipated that it might be made the excuse for local difficulties beyond their power of control.

The negotiations between China and the Vatican respecting the removal of the Roman Catholic cathedral at Peking were brought to a satisfactory conclusion in June. The cathedral, which stood within the grounds of the imperial palace on a site bestowed on the missionaries by the Emperor Kanghi, had been restored after the war in 1860. Its immediate proximity to the palace was a constant annoyance to the Chinese as well as a memorial of their disaster. The Emperor, therefore, granted the missionaries an equivalent site within the city, but away from the palace, and indemnified them for the cost of rebuilding. This arrangement between China and Rome preparing the way for a direct representation of the Vatican at Peking would relieve the missionaries from the anomalies of French protection.

An article in the Treaty of Peace between China and France



y 1885 had provided that, in the event of the Chinese Government deciding to construct railways, she would apply to the industry. By this many were led to suppose that China was about to develop a railway system forthwith, and several hastened to take advantage of this new departure in Chinese affairs. General Wilson, from North America, was the first to appear at Tientsin. On submitting his plans to the Chinese authorities, it was intimated to him that there was no immediate intention of carrying out any general railway system. The agents from Berlin were a trifle more lucky, for they obtained a contract for the short line between Tientsin and the Peiho. The German representatives came, bringing with them a railway, rails, and trucks on the Decauville system. They failed, however, to convince Li Hung Chang of the immediate need of railway works, but they managed to obtain two small contracts for deepening the harbour of Port Arthur, and for building two iron bridges across the Peiho. Lastly came the English agents provided with a model railway, which supplied a permanent source of amusement in the official residence of the Taotai of Shanghai, but no official or final decision was arrived at. It is, however, only a question of time for railways to become general in China, their practical utility being recognised by Li Hung Chang having actually opened the experimental line of the Decauville Railway (21) with some show of official patronage.

Other symptoms of the awakening of the Chinese to the wants of modern times were not wanting. In the course of the year the Imperial Government inaugurated a postal system between the principal ports, to be worked in the first instance by the Customs, but to be gradually extended throughout the country; a nautical telegraph service was considerably developed, and an exploring expedition was despatched to the Amoor, preparatory to the establishment of a Chinese Steam Navigation Company on the river. Two large and powerful steel cruisers, built by order of the Chinese Government, were launched from the shipyard of Armstrong at Newcastle, and would probably be, when completed, among the most formidable vessels of their class and armament.

The Commission charged with the delimitation of the Russo-Chinese frontier in the Ussuri territory concluded its labours in April, and the final protocol was signed during the month. It was expected there would now be an improvement in the political relations between the two empires. Negotiations were also carried on with Portugal in order to regulate and put on a better footing the port of Macao, which had become the headquarters of smugglers and other enemies of trade. In the British colony of Hong Kong the Governor (Sir G. Bowen) obtained the consent of the Imperial Government to a large increase in the number of the *non-official* members of the Legislative Council, and the *magistrates* and the Chamber of Commerce obtain-

ing the privilege of nominating their own representatives, and the entire taxation of the colony was placed under the control of the colonial legislature. Under the stimulus of responsibility, public works long needed were, on the recommendation of a Commissioner, set on foot for the better water-supply and drainage of the colony, and the construction of defensive works was proceeded with vigorously.

### JAPAN.

As the year 1885 was closing, some important changes in the principles and *personnel* of the Government of Japan were proclaimed. When in 1868 the Mikado, then a lad of fifteen, had been restored to the ancient but long-dormant rights of sole monarch, the new Government was for a while in a transitional phase. By 1871 it had assumed a more durable form, little varied subsequently, and containing as its chief feature a Supreme Council of State, presided over by a Chancellor of the Empire assisted by two colleagues. A council of this nature had been originally introduced into Japan nearly twelve centuries before and at a time when the Sovereign was a minor. It was therefore regarded as specially adapted to the present Mikado's case. It was, however, only looked upon as a temporary expedient, and the experience of fourteen years fully established the necessity for a change. Moreover, it was no longer applicable, since the Mikado had attained his majority. The Crown was in danger of being overshadowed by the power and functions of the Chancellor, and the cardinal principle of personal government by the Emperor was called in question. Added to this, the astonishing speed with which Japan was moving forward had developed problems and duties which threatened to overwhelm the Chancellor and his two associates. Such considerations demanded a new constitution, if the future welfare were to be assured. The Council of State was therefore abolished, and with it the offices of Chancellor and his two colleagues. Government as reconstituted consists of the Emperor, the Minister, President of the State, the Cabinet, and the Senate. Of the new features, the most important is the separation of the legislative and executive authority, hitherto combined in the person of the Mikado. As head of the State he will in future take an active part in public affairs, and in the Cabinet, of which he appoints and dismisses the members, he will personally direct all matters of State; he will hold each of his Ministers in the strictest responsibility to himself, and he will affix the sign-manual to all the principal enactments. The Minister President of State will possess very wide powers. As chief adviser to the Crown, he will, under the Emperor, give general directions concerning every branch of administration, and have the supervision of control over every department, requiring information from each as to the business within its control.

case of necessity, he may suspend or annul any departmental measure pending the Sovereign's instructions; and every ordinance must receive his signature before it can become law. In the Cabinet, which will consist of the President of the State and the nine Ministers of Executive Departments, each Minister is directly responsible to the Emperor for all matters connected with his department, enjoys increased powers therein, and has the right to communicate personally with the Emperor on subjects for which he is individually responsible. The Senate, or fourth factor in the Government, will possess little or no real power. It is a purely consultative body, composed of forty members nominated by the Crown, and generally chosen for special attainments or past experience in the public service. It is powerless either to originate measures or to veto them, and its functions are limited to the discussion and elaboration of such matters as the Cabinet may choose to refer to it, and to the modification of details. Such changes mark a highly important and interesting period in the political history of Japan, and probably offer the first instance on an almost revolutionary scale of a nation elaborating rules to guide the working of the whole of its State Departments. The adoption of a European system of government by an Oriental State can only be justified by the result, and of this it will be impossible to judge until after the proposed changes are completed by the summoning of a Japanese Parliament in 1890.

Counts Ito and Inouye, the two eminent statesmen who have stood together for many years as the leaders in the transformation of the Government, became Premier and Foreign Minister, so that the outcome of these changes will, in the first instance, be borne by their responsible authors. After repeated postponements, the long-talked-of Conference for the revision of the treaties with Foreign Powers began its labours in Tokio (May 1), but the basis upon which the deliberations started was foredoomed to failure. The original proposals made by the Japanese Government two years previously had been first revised to satisfy the rival interests of the seventeen Treaty Powers, and had been mutilated by the latter, so that when the Conference met little of the original proposals remained.

In 1882 the Mikado's Government had proposed a broad and reasonable measure, providing that the opening of the country and the removal of commercial restrictions should proceed *pari passu* with the abolition of consular jurisdiction, and at the same time offering ample safeguards for the rights and interests of foreigners during the progress of the change. This measure, with its scheme of Special Territorial Courts, was ultimately ejected, and chiefly at the instance of the British Minister. It was followed by another proposal, subsequently reduced by the European Government to an abstract resolution to abolish the *system of consular jurisdiction*. With such meagre mat

the labours of the Conference soon came to a deadlock ; but the British Minister, the Hon. Sir F. Plunkett, working in harmony with the new German Minister, proposed a reasonable solution of the difficulty. His plan, in its main features, followed that offered by the Japanese in 1882, and contemplated a dual status for foreigners in that country. Those residing in the seven present treaty settlements, and choosing to conduct their business on the old lines and under the old restrictions, would continue to enjoy extra-territorial immunity from Japanese jurisdiction. Those residing, owning real property, or doing business outside of the settlements would be amenable in all respects to Japanese jurisdiction, with the one exception of capital crimes, for which special guarantees for foreigners would be provided. This dual status was to last for three years, at the end of which period foreigners and Japanese would enjoy equal privileges everywhere in Japan and be subject to Japanese jurisdiction, though the special guarantees for the protection of foreigners would continue in force for a further period of twelve years. With regard to the tariff, virtual agreement had existed for some time among the Powers, the one point upon which there was a want of unanimity being as to the time when the new tariff should come into operation : the Japanese wished to put it in force at once. The expense of the new system, of the appointment of twenty-five foreign judges, of the training of numerous judges, interpreters, and lawyers, and of translating the codes into English (for English was to be the official language of the Courts) would be considerable, and it was, therefore, not only fair but of importance that the new tariff should be made operative without delay. The British Government, on the other hand, held that the tariff and the new jurisdiction should take effect simultaneously, at the beginning of 1889. This one point of difference did not last long, nor permanently affect the relations between the Powers. In August the Mikado invited the British Minister to a private audience, and addressed him in the warmest terms, expressing his satisfaction at the part he had taken in revising the Treaties, and announcing his desire to send the Prince of Wales the Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Chrysanthemum. Prince Komatsu visited Europe later in the year and was entrusted with this mission, the ceremony taking place at Marlborough House. And shortly afterwards the same distinction was conferred at Berlin on the Emperor of Germany.

Journalism, like other matters, has been making rapid progress in Japan. The first political journal appeared in 1833 at Tokio, then known as Yeddo, but the revolution of 1865 brought about a great change, and newspapers soon became plentiful, one of the first being a Government paper called the *Kampo*, still in existence. On June 18, 1871, the first daily paper, the *Mainichi Shimbun*, was brought out at Yokohama : it is now published at Tokio, its daily circulation being about 15,000.

the other leading papers are the *Nichi Shimbun* (*Daily News*), the *Choya Shimbun* (organ of the Government and the people), and the *Jiji Shimbun* (*Times*). Most of the small towns have papers of their own, whilst at Tokio two monthly reviews and half a dozen illustrated papers and magazines are published. There are also 37 journals devoted to education, 7 to medicine, to sanitation, 29 to science, and others.

German influence is for the moment paramount in Japan, and can be traced in the new Constitutional Government, of which Germany furnished their model. Count Ito, during his journey to Europe in 1882, was thrown much among the Germans, and was struck by the details of their administrative system. On his return to Japan he found Germans naturally of more assistance to him than other foreigners in preparing for the great constitutional change in view. The advisers of the cabinet on points of constitutional law and procedure, and especially in the matter of education, have for the most part been Germans. Close upon the revolution in the system of government has followed a not less complete change in the national dress. The native costume of many centuries which has charmed artists and amateurs is doomed, and men and women are bringing themselves to adopt European clothes, as well as customs, in many respects wholly unsuitable. In future the Empress is to wear European dress on state occasions, and has given an order for 40,000*l.* of dresses from Paris and Berlin. The ladies of her court are to adopt the same foreign fashions, but for the present other ladies may exercise free choice. This year will always be remembered in the financial history of Japan as the year in which specie resumption took place.

#### COREA.

The occupation of Port Hamilton by Great Britain has been much discussed during the year, and strong views both for and against its abandonment were advanced from various quarters. Opinion in favour of its retention was emphasised during the summer, when it was rumoured that Russia had seized Port Lazareff, as a set-off to the British occupation of Port Hamilton. The movements of Russian ships on this occasion were sufficiently suspicious for China to send two ironclads, two gunboats, and two cruisers to Vladivostock (Aug. 1), but the result showed that Russia had at least no immediate intention of annexation. She could have had no justification for seizing Port Lazareff, which forms an integral part of the Korean kingdom, and its seizure would certainly have been resented by both the Japanese and the Chinese Governments. Port Hamilton, consisting of two rocky islets with a few resident families of fishermen, had been temporarily occupied (May 12, 1885) by Great Britain, after an



express arrangement between the late Sir Harry Parkes and Li Hung Chang, and an assurance was at the same time conveyed to the Chinese Government that the port would be restored under certain defined conditions. By the end of August rumour had grown so strong that a Russian Protectorate was about to be established in Corea that nine Chinese war-vessels with a military force were forthwith despatched to Chemulpo, and large numbers of Chinese soldiers entered Seoul disguised as merchants. Great excitement prevailed, and a riotous mob attacked the troops. Russia, however, refrained from any active demonstration, but up to the end of October the Chinese Government was kept in constant alarm by the attempts of the Russian Minister at Seoul to induce the Corean King to accept a Russian Protectorate.

## CHAPTER VI.

### AFRICA.

#### EGYPT—SOUTH AFRICA—THE CONGO—MADAGASCAR.

##### I. EGYPT.

NEW YEAR'S DAY found public attention once more directed to military matters, the centre of interest being that portion of the southern frontier watered by the Nile, where a large force of predatory Arabs had collected. The heavy defeats inflicted upon the Arabs during the Soudan campaign of the previous year, followed by the death of the Mahdi, had removed the fear of an immediate invasion. It was, nevertheless, well known that the Arab imagination had been deeply stirred by the hopes aroused of an invasion of Upper Egypt, and the rumour of an intended advance of the Desert Arabs disturbed the tranquillity to which the Egyptian Government had been looking forward. The extent of the danger, however, and the certainty that any advance would cause a general scare, had been fully appreciated by the British military authorities, and General Stephenson had been sent to Koseh to attack and disperse the Arab force concentrated there. The engagements with the Arabs, which extended over the last two days of 1885 and the first few days of 1886, were of a somewhat serious character, and in the fighting which took place the Arabs gave repeated proofs of their unswerving courage. On more than one occasion they charged up to within a few yards of our infantry, armed with breechloaders, but with no avail, and in the end the combined British and Egyptian force under General Stephenson drove back the Arab invaders. The village of Giniss, which had been loopholed and fortified by the

, was, after an obstinate defence, carried at the point of Bayonet, and though the Arabs rallied again and again on surrounding ridges they were ultimately compelled to retreat in confusion, leaving upon the battlefield about six hundred dead, including three important emirs, and abandoning the whole of their ammunition and baggage. The British loss was comparatively slight and unimportant. A satisfactory feature in these engagements was that the Egyptian soldiers associated with the British were found to stand firm, and to display considerable courage for fighting. The defeat of the Arabs was followed up by the capture on the Nile (by the *Lotus*) of their fleet of tug-boats laden with arms, ammunition, and uniforms.

The checks thus given to the invaders proved sufficient to prevent any further attempt during the remainder of the year. One of the first results of the more peaceful aspect was a withdrawal of the united British and Egyptian troops to Wady Halfa, which had been constituted the most southern point of the Egyptian frontier. The place having been fortified was now left in the care of the Egyptians, the British regiments being withdrawn to Assouan. It was further hoped that this withdrawal towards the north would favourably affect the condition of our troops during the hot season, but the result hardly justified this anticipation, and the garrison left at Assouan found the terrible heat

of the Egyptian summer a far more formidable enemy than the British. During the months of June and July, when the temperature at times reached as high as 124 degrees, the ravages caused by sunstroke and enteric fever were of a very serious character, and the expediency of maintaining a force so far south was seriously questioned both in Egypt and England. The restlessness of the Arabs, however, and the fact that they still retained much of their military organisation, were circumstances which could not be overlooked, and the necessity for keeping a British force within striking distance of the enemy was established. Towards the close of the year, when some Arab reconnoitring parties had to be dispersed immediately beyond the frontier line. On the shores of the Red Sea the port of Souakim was, early in the year, placed under the charge of Sir C. Warren, a small British and Indian force being retained there to give support to the Egyptian garrison. The old enemy of the British, Osman Digna, was known to be still in the neighbourhood, but he had lost much of his former power and influence. The Arab tribes, instead of being united under one leader, had relapsed into their old condition of mutual hostility and predatory warfare, instead of the tribes or clans siding with the Egyptians. This circumstance was judiciously turned to account by Sir C. Warren, the friendly Arabs, having been supplied with arms, were engaged to attack the followers of Osman Digna, with the result that the latter were defeated in several minor engagements. *The recall of Sir C. Warren to the governorship of the Red*

Sea littoral was entrusted to General Watson, with full civil and military command. Later in the year Major Kitchener was appointed civil and military governor of Souakim, a position he retained until its close. During the year skirmishes between the friendly and opposing Arabs were frequent, and although, as customary in Arab warfare, the chief object of the contending forces was the acquisition of plunder, the bands recognising the leadership of Osman Digna were ultimately dispersed. The most important of these engagements was one fought in the early part of October between the friendly tribe of Amaras and the rebels, when the former, after a sharp fight in which they lost forty in killed and wounded, succeeded in storming Osman Digna's stronghold of Tamai, capturing eighteen guns and two Gatlings, together with a large number of rifles forming part of the spoils taken from the Egyptians in 1884. No serious attack was made upon Souakim during the year, and though at first, owing to the disturbed condition of the country, the trade of the port was greatly restricted, there were signs of a substantial improvement during the autumn and the closing months of the year.

In civil affairs the close of 1885 had been marked by the arrival of the Turkish Commissioner, Muhktar Pasha, in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-Turkish Convention, concluded in the preceding October. The Turkish Government, which from the first had been greatly annoyed at the interposition of England, and had viewed with much distrust the innovations introduced into Egyptian Administration by the British Government, at length consented to provide the English Commissioner with an Oriental colleague, though whether with the object of facilitating or impeding reforms was a matter of doubt. At the Conferences held early in the year, Muhktar Pasha professed himself anxious to hear what reforms the British Commissioner wished to introduce. Sir H. Wolff declared that, so far as the internal administration of the country was concerned, he found matters progressing fairly satisfactorily, except as regarded the Soudan, and upon this point it was the place of the Egyptian and Turkish Governments to take the initiative. In response, after some delay, the Turkish Commissioner submitted a scheme for the reorganisation of the Egyptian army, according to which he proposed that the numbers should be raised from 8,000 to 16,800 men, in addition to 6,700 gendarmerie and police. The increased expenditure entailed thereby he proposed to meet by a reduction of pay, the effecting of certain economies in army expenditure, and the relinquishment on the part of England of the sum of 200,000*l.* E. charged to the Egyptian revenue, as a contribution towards the maintenance of the army of occupation. The enlarged army which would form a recognised portion of the forces at the disposal of the Sultan he proposed should be organised in a manner analagous to the Turkish army, and that it should be utilised for the recovery of a part at least of the

This scheme was duly discussed with Oriental deliberation in Egypt, and then submitted to the British Government, from which it proved wholly unacceptable. In their reply it was pointed out that the suggested reconquest of the Soudan or any part of it was a course entirely opposed to the policy of Great Britain, that the number of men proposed was far in excess of the requirements of the country, that it was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of order that British officers should be associated with the Egyptian troops, and finally that the Egyptian Government's contribution to the expenses of the army of occupation could not be reckoned upon. The Turkish Commissioner was invited to modify his proposals in accordance with the wishes of the British Government, and he in turn applied for fresh instructions from Constantinople. The advisers of the Sultan, however, were in no hurry to accept fresh suggestions, and, although diplomatic fencing was carried on between the representatives of the British and Turkish Governments with the utmost courtesy and consideration, the whole of the year passed without any step towards a definite settlement having been taken. The advantage, however, certainly remained with the British Government, which was enabled to proceed in its work of reform without hindrance on the part of the Egyptians, while the public association of the two Commissioners tended to remove the hostility of the Egyptians towards British influence. In the month of March the Egyptian Government attempted to improve the very defective condition of the Egyptian currency by the issue of 6,600,000 new silver piastres, which had been coined at the Berlin mint. Unhappily the usefulness of this important measure was somewhat impaired at the outset by the introduction of large quantities of counterfeit coin which had been made in Europe, and surreptitiously imported into the country. Some efforts were made to detect and arrest the swindlers who had worked the scheme, but for the most part they succeeded in eluding justice. A little later in the year the attention of the Egyptian Government was called to certain apparent irregularities in the letting of the Government lands at Fayoum, and the administration of the estates of the Daira Sanieh. A Commission was appointed to inquire into the matter, and its report resulted in the discovery of wholesale speculation on the part of the Mudir of Fayoum, and the Director General of the Daira Sanieh, Khalil Pasha. The inquiry, however, also resulted in the discovery that although two Controllers, one English and one Egyptian, had been appointed with large salaries and extensive powers to supervise the administration of the Daira Sanieh, they had wholly failed to detect the irregularities of their Egyptian colleagues, even though they had been warned as to his character. The satisfactory outcome of European supervision of the administration of the country was the equilibrium established between the income and expenditure of the country. *This was undoubtedly ascribed to the relief afforded*

the loan of the previous year ; but, independently of this, the net receipts of the administrations and provinces assigned to the public debt charge realised a surplus of over 330,000*l.*, after allowing for the reimbursement of the 5 per cent. tax on the coupons. The Administrative Budget, on the other hand, was expected to show a deficit of about 250,000*l.*, but more than half of this amount would be received in accordance with the terms of the Convention from the surplus to the credit of the public debt, a result much more favourable than was anticipated when the Convention was agreed to. In conclusion, it remains to be noted that the hostility to the British Government which had been displayed by the representatives of France during the previous year was continued in a milder form throughout 1886. The most important act of obstruction was the refusal of the French agent to permit the partial abolition of the *corvée*, or employment of forced labour on public works, although desired by the Egyptian Government. In the month of May a draft decree authorising the expenditure of the sum of 250,000*l.*, which had been saved by the partial abolition of the *corvée*, was drawn up by the Egyptian Government, and submitted to the Consuls-General. The Consuls subsequently referred the decree to the Caisse de la Dette, intimating that if the latter agreed with the Government the Consuls would raise no difficulties. The Caisse in its turn suggested one or two modifications, which were accepted by the Government, and the corrected draft decree was communicated to the Consuls-General in July. After a short time the representatives of all the Powers, with the exception of France, received instructions to accept the decree, but they deferred officially signifying their assent until their French colleague joined them in the step. Simultaneously, however, a prominent official post in Egypt, hitherto filled by a Frenchman, became vacant, and the French Government refused to assent to the decree until a French successor should be selected for the place. Negotiations ensued, which terminated in a disagreement between Nubar Pasha and Count d'Aunay, and the assent of France to the decree was persistently refused. It was pointed out to the French Government that if France declined to assent to the decree the Egyptian Government would be compelled to call out the whole of the *corvée* in 1887, and that meanwhile the completion of some important public works was suspended, including a number of contracts in connection with irrigation schemes ; but all representations proved unavailing, and the year closed upon what appeared like a deadlock.

Farther southwards, on the confines of Abyssinia, the Italians made considerable progress in establishing their colony at Massowah. The fortifications erected during the preceding year were increased and strengthened both on the land and sea side of the port ; a force of Bashi-Bazouks was maintained for the protection of the caravans, and everything was done to encourage trade,



which proved on the whole brisk though intermittent. The administration of the colony was ably conducted by the commandant, his policy being to cultivate friendly relations with the neighbouring tribes as far as possible. In spite, however, of the efforts of the Italians to conciliate the Abyssinians, the latter showed no disposition to abandon their desire for the port of Massowah, and the year closed with the threatening advance of an Abyssinian force, of which the numerical strength and ulterior designs were but imperfectly known.

## II. SOUTH AFRICA.

*Cape Colony.*—There were many signs at the beginning of the year that the depression which had prevailed throughout the colony since 1878 was beginning to pass away. The various wars in which the colony had been engaged had cost about four millions, which, except to enrich a few contractors, had proved to the community at large a dead loss. The bad blood stirred up in the abortive struggle with the Boers had done still more mischief, and the patched-up peace which ended it had impressed the Boers with the conviction that they would be safe at any time in defying British authority. The Basutoland and Bechuanaland disturbances had also checked colonial trade, and deprived Cape merchants of growing outlets for their goods. Over-production, too, in diamonds, ostrich feathers, and mohair had had the usual result: prices fell, and there was a general collapse. Excessive Customs duties was another aid to depression, and had not served to protect native industries. Public favour was inclining to a land-tax as a sharp antidote for the Boer monopoly, by which the whole colony had been impoverished, and its best lands allowed to remain untilled. As the year wore on, the result of the Bechuanaland expedition restored confidence in British power; and it was hoped that race animosities were subsiding, as British ideas spread and proved to the Boer farmer that there was room in the country for all. The combination in one person of the offices of High Commissioner for South Africa and the Governor of Cape Colony had not been attended with wholly satisfactory results, but, in view of the approaching termination of Sir Hercules Robinson's tenure, no change was attempted. In his South African career he had distinguished himself by moderation and judgment. Divergences between Imperial and Colonial policy could not fail to recur, and, as the representative of both, he was frequently placed in an invidious position. As Governor, he was bound to accept the advice of the Colonial Government, as tendered by the party in power, and, as High Commissioner, he had to carry out the instructions of the Home Government, and, when they conflicted, to find a *ground of conciliation*.

The Cape Parliament met early in April, and with delay Mr. Sprigg made his Budget statement (April 15). His estimate for the financial year ended June 30, 1886, had shown a revenue of 3,170,000*l.*, and an expenditure of 3,370,000*l.*, leaving a deficiency of 200,000*l.*, which he proposed to meet by converting the existing debenture debt into inscribed stock. The revenue and expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1887, were estimated at 3,300,000*l.* The deficiency of the previous year, however, proved in August to have been under-estimated, the actual deficit being 475,047*l.*, showing the net decrease of income compared with the previous year of 262,357*l.*

After a confusing session, Parliament was prorogued (June 1) and, although thirty-six bills received the Governor's assent, the tendency of the legislation was retrogressive. The Dutch Party were in power, but they refused ministerial responsibility, and the Government, though repeatedly outvoted, was maintained in office. The Transkei Representation Bill passed through the House of Assembly, but was rejected by the Upper Chamber, but the Excise Abolition Bill was passed by both Houses in spite of a probable loss to the revenue of 100,000*l.* per annum. In the Eastern province of the colony, a political union started with the view of counteracting the influence of the *cander Bund*, and the rival parties seemed likely to adopt distinctive relations of Liberals and Conservatives. An independence meeting was held in July at Umzimkulu, on account of the rejection of the Transkei Representation Bill, and resolutions were passed advocating separation from Cape Colony, and the union of the two Transkei territories, Basutoland and Pondoland. Frequent fighting occurred on the Pondo border between the Pondos and the Xesibes, followed in September by the annexation of the Xesibe country to Cape Colony, and by the Pondos petitioning the Queen for an inquiry into their grievances. The former step, taken on the representation of the Cape Parliament and Ministry, was also in accordance with the wishes of the natives. It was, moreover, indorsed by Sir H. Robinson, as tending to promote the chances of a peaceful settlement of existing difficulties between the Xesibes and the Pondos. The Pondos' claim that the St. John's River, port, and territory which had been annexed without their consent should be restored to them could not be entertained by the Imperial Government; but Sir H. Robinson, with the concurrence of the Cape Government, offered to discuss with them the terms of pecuniary compensation for any losses they might have sustained by the proclamation of 1878, a matter on which they had refused to negotiate. The so-called raids of the Pondos into the Xesibe country were probably reprisals, and in many of them they merely re-entered their own territory which had been taken from them without their consent. The policy adopted by the Imperial Government to maintain peace and justice in the

territory outside the colonial border met with no small success, and in December matters were amicably settled, and an agreement came to between the Cape Government and the Pondo chiefs. Umquikela accepted the terms offered, granting a free road through Pondo territory, and giving assurances that no further disturbances should occur on the border. In return, the Cape Government waived all claim to compensation for the recent raids into the Xesibe country, and agreed to pay the Pondos a lump sum of 1,600*l.* for the annexation of territory, and an annuity of 200*l.* for the loss of the Rhode territory. In the important matter of colonial defence against foreign attack, some satisfactory progress was made. The permanent defences at Simon's Bay were proceeded with rapidly, but little was done at Table Bay, although the harbour there is practically undefended, and the shipping and town are at the mercy of any first-class ironclad. The present area of the docks and basins is about 26 acres; there is a fine graving dock, and a massive quay wall, 600 feet in length, affording shelter for the largest steamers. A design has also been approved for enclosing a further area of 62 acres of water.

*Basutoland.*—A marked improvement was visible in the political and material condition of the year. The Chief, Masupha, abandoned his contumacious attitude, and requested that a magistrate might be stationed in his district. This was done, and chief and people co-operated cordially in the maintenance of peace and order. Brandy-drinking, which for some time had been the curse of the country, has been almost eradicated; at the close of the year no canteen remained throughout Basutoland, and the people returned to their former habits of industry and sobriety. The Western border, between Caledon River and Cornet Spruit, which had hitherto been in dispute, has now been clearly defined and beacons by a joint Boundary Commission. Much of the trouble on this border was caused by the lawlessness of the Orange Free State burghers living in the neighbourhood. Within a distance of 20 miles there were during the summer five well-known illicit canteens, two of them being on farms belonging to Orange Free State officials, and, although Basutoland maintains a force of 200 police for preserving order on its side of the frontier, the Orange Free State provides no police for border work. The disturbances, nevertheless, sensibly diminished during the year, and the terms of an extradition convention between the two countries were agreed to by both governments. The revenue for the year ending June 30 was 6,786*l.*, which, with the contribution from Cape Colony, was found sufficient to meet all necessary expenditure, showing that the resumption of direct Imperial rule over the territory had not imposed any fresh burdens upon the British taxpayer. Sir Marshall Clarke, to whose personal efforts the pacification of the country is principally due, exercised a very considerable

influence over all with whom he came in contact, and his administration was characterised by the display of much patience and judgment.

*Bechuanaland.*—Although freebooting from over the Transvaal border had not wholly died out, and although the chiefs of the Montsioa and Mankoroane would not admit that all their claims were reasonable and unreasonable, had been recognised, the general results of Sir Charles Warren's expedition and the impressions it left behind were not difficult to discover. Mr. Shippard, Charles Warren's successor as Administrator and Chief Magistrate of British Bechuanaland, was authorised to take all necessary measures for promoting peace, order, and good government, subject to instructions given by Sir Hercules Robinson. He also appointed Deputy Commissioner for the parts of Bechuanaland and the Kalahari under British protection. From the outset he applied himself diligently to the work of pacification, earning no little credit from his chiefs and from the public, although his action in arresting and trying certain members of the late Fetsi's party for sedition and incitement to civil war was warmly criticised. At a later period of the year, when Sir Hercules Robinson visited the country he found matters progressing favourably, and expressed his confidence that ere long the country would settle down and, with the help of the police, become quiet. Bechuanaland, now a Crown colony, has for its limit the Molopo River beyond which, in the terms of the Queen's proclamation, the Protectorate extending westward to long. 20°, and northward to lat. 22°, including Shoshong, Khama's country. This chief consented to come under British protection, but objected to his country being "cut in two," although, like the other chiefs ruling to the south of him, he has offered part of his country to Great Britain as a method of paying for the assistance Sir C. Warren had afforded him. He was, moreover, anxious for the peaceful development of his country, and for its protection against freebooters. In like manner, also, the industrious Basuto people, to the north of Zululand, and the inhabitants of Swaziland in South-East Africa, were eagerly seeking British protection. Turning to another part of the country, the position of affairs was less satisfactory. Mumusu, a town in that portion of Bechuanaland which, by the London Convention, had been included in Transvaal territory, was captured early in the year by the Boers, Massouw, its chief, and many of its people were massacred, the survivors cruelly treated and dispersed, and their lands and cattle confiscated. Massouw was one of the chiefs whose cause the Boers had espoused against the Montsioa and Mankoroane, and now within a few months they had destroyed him and his tribe. Later on they murdered the well-known Zulu Chief Dabulamanzi in the Reserve, whither he had fled on learning that he was to be arrested. The Commissioners who in October 1885 had been appointed to determine the various

aims, and generally to effect a settlement of land in British Bechuanaland, issued their report in May. They recommended : (1) life annuities to Monkoroane and Montsioa of 300*l.* a year each ; (2) grants, as an indulgence, to seven of the Rooi Grond claimants ; (3) the grant of a farm to Messrs. Musson, as compensation for losses sustained by them at the hands of the freebooters ; (4) grants of farms to forty or fifty of the Bechuanaland Border Police, to be held for the first three years on military tenure ; (5) a village of fifty erven to be established at Rooi Grond ; (6) the appointment of an inspector of native reserves, with an assistant ; and (7) the establishment of a European township at Kuruman. The receipts from the sale of town lots were to be expended on the sanitary arrangements and ornamentation of the place. Sir H. Robinson concurred in these recommendations, but suggested, with regard to the village at Rooi Grond, that the titles to the fifty agricultural erven should contain clauses prohibiting the sub-letting or subdivision of each erf, so as to limit the expansion of a village immediately on the Transvaal border. He was, moreover, of opinion that as the difficult and complicated questions before the Commission had been completely and judiciously disposed of, provision should be made for the requirements of the natives by setting apart large tribal reserves. Mr. Shippard, Administrator and Chief Magistrate, had acted as President of the Commission. Under his supervision, the Secretary had marked off the boundary of the district to be reserved for Montsioa and Moshette ; one Commissioner had inquired into the land question in Mankoroane's country, whilst the other examined the Stellaland titles. Nearly all the Stellaland claimants received grants from the Commission, and out of 252 only 22 were English, the rest being Boers. These recommendations were in addition to the awards of the numerous European claims, which were given after a careful judicious consideration of the evidence brought forward in each case. Some serious charges of outrage were preferred by the Wesleyan Missionary Society against the Bechuanaland police, and created such general indignation that a strict investigation took place. It was clearly ascertained that the charges were without foundation, and official papers were published containing a complete vindication of the officers and men of the police force. The Secretary of State for the Colonies also wrote to the Wesleyan Missionary Society, to express regret that a Society in their position should have indorsed, without sufficient inquiry, charges of so grave a nature.

*Natal and Zululand.*—Two years of absolute immunity from Imperial interference had been construed by the Boer settlers in Zululand as a tacit toleration of their proceedings. They became therefore greatly excited when informed at the beginning of the year that the British Government could not recognise their title to the lands they had surveyed and appropriated, nor



would the occupation of St. Lucia Bay or the adjacent territory to the north and west be permitted. The warning was met by the Boers with the announcement that they would hold their farms at any cost, in spite of the fact that at this moment their relations with the Zulus were critical, Umnyamena and the Zulu traders having refused to recognise the Boer boundary lines. They lost no time, however, in trying the effect of an armed demonstration, which was made early in March in North Zululand, partly to overawe malcontents within their own borders, and partly to impress the Governor of Natal (Sir Arthur Havelock) with their resolve to resent interference. A Zulu deputation, on the other hand, visited the British Sub-Commissioner at Isandhlwana, to solicit help against Boer encroachments, and the Governor soon after stated publicly that the Government were coming to some arrangement which he hoped would satisfy all concerned. In pursuance of this promise he received in May the Zulu Princes Undabuco and Shingana, and explained to them the views of the Home Government, giving them time to consider their reply. When the great chief Dinizulu had asked the Boers to help him in his quarrel with Usibepu, he did not foresee the inevitable sequel. Having given their assistance and fought some battles on his behalf, the Boers refused to retire. Finding the country to their taste and the soil fertile, they compelled Dinizulu much against his will to give them land. They then declared the Zulus could not keep order among themselves, and that the "New Republic," as they termed their newly acquired land, suffered from the lawlessness of the native tribes. The alternative thus presented to the Natal Government was the extension of a British Protectorate over the country, or its formal annexation to Natal. Distrusting the attitude of the Governor in his negotiations with the Zululand Boers, the Legislative Council telegraphed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, offering to take over Zululand and to incorporate it with their colony, undertaking at the same time to defray any additional cost of administration. The colonists regarded with much apprehension the prospect of Zululand being surrendered to the Boers, whose land-claims threatened to absorb five-sixths of the country. The effect of such a surrender would be to drive multitudes of Zulus out of their own territory into the Reserve and thence across the Natal frontier. Such an incursion would tax the resources of even a flourishing State, but it would be ruin to a small and not too wealthy colony, and for this reason the inhabitants of Natal voluntarily offered to take upon themselves the responsibility of governing the country.

Meanwhile the negotiations which Sir A. Havelock had been carrying on with the Boer leaders since the spring had come to a standstill. The latter objected to the boundary line which it was proposed should divide Zululand into two portions—viz Western Zululand, which was to form the New Republic, and

Eastern Zululand, which was to be reserved to the Zulus. The situation then threatened to become serious, for the occupation of farms by the Boers was still going on, and far beyond the boundary line referred to in the negotiations; so that by the end of the autumn the whole of the Reserve territory seemed likely to be cut off from Eastern Zululand. The need of some settlement was pressing. Negotiations were reopened, and the Boers were informed that the time had come when, if they would not negotiate, the British Government would be compelled to fix its own boundary line. This show of determination brought the Boers to their senses, and an agreement was come to in November such on the terms proposed in the spring, and Zululand was divided into two portions. From the land east of the dividing-line all Boer farmers and all Boer claims were to be withdrawn immediately. The Boer Protectorate of Zululand was to be abandoned, and the protection of European missionaries was to be absolutely guaranteed throughout Zululand. Certain routes to the north were also to be opened. As soon as these conditions were fulfilled, the British Government would be prepared to recognise Western Zululand, *i.e.* the land to the west of the dividing-line, as the "New Republic," upon terms somewhat similar to the London Convention of 1884. As soon, too, as Her Majesty's Government was satisfied that it was the desire of the Zulu people, a British Protectorate should be declared over the whole of Eastern Zululand from the Reserve down to the borders of Tongaland. By these arrangements sufficient territory would be retained for the maintenance of the Zulu people; they would, with their own consent, be secured in the possession of the rights so reserved to them; there would be a free outlet from the Reserve into Eastern Zululand and the countries beyond; the whole coast-line to the border of Tongaland would be under British protection; the rights of the missionary bodies throughout Zululand would be secured; and, finally, these results would be obtained without any breach of the relations existing between the two principal races of European extraction in South Africa. On being informed of these arrangements, the Natal Council passed a resolution to the effect that the interests of the colony had not been duly considered in the settlement, and reiterating its readiness to undertake the government of Eastern Zululand as the only means of securing peace and order. The Volksraad of the New Republic forthwith ratified (Dec. 1) the agreement for the settlement of Zululand, and a fortnight later the Boundary Commission began its task of marking out the frontier.

The Governor, in his opening speech (Sept. 8) to the Legislative Council, referred to the increasing deficit during the last three years, by which the credit balances, amounting to 227,000*l.*, had been converted at the end of 1885 into a liability of nearly 1,000*l.*, while it was estimated that the revenue of the current year would fall short of the expenditure by 185,000*l.* H.

represented, therefore, that it would be necessary to resort to additional taxation, which was estimated to produce 66,000*l*. The Council, however, was of opinion that retrenchment, and the certain increase of revenue consequent on the revival of trade and the development of the goldfields, would obviate the necessity for additional taxation, save for productive works.

Before the close of the year the Legislative Council adopted the new tariff, remitting the duty on spirits, wine, and tea in transit over the border, freeing machinery from duty, and fixing low rates for certain articles of food. Considerable indignation was, however, felt in Pietermaritzburg, by the discovery that proposals in favour of transit duty had been submitted by the Volksraad and President of the Orange Free State to the Governor in June, which had not been communicated to the Council, and had been vetoed by the British Government. The Council accordingly passed a resolution censuring the Governor for suppressing the Orange Free State's proposals as to fiscal concessions, and for allowing legislation to proceed on the question without keeping the members informed of the changes proposed. The Council further felt much aggrieved at having been debarred all information regarding the negotiations for the settlement of Zululand until it was too late, but, as they were powerless to interfere with the Convention, they were unwilling to suggest any breach of faith with a community of which the future relations with Natal would inevitably be of a close character. They, nevertheless, maintained the view that the annexation of the Reserve and Eastern Zululand to Natal was the only satisfactory solution to the Zulu difficulty.

*Transvaal.*—Though gold was being found in all parts of South Africa, it was in the Transvaal that during the year it was discovered in such quantities, and of such richness, as to turn the stream of immigration to the diggings. The quality of the gold was said to be equal to that of Australia; and some goldfields discovered at Heidelberg during the summer yielded as much as 16 oz. to the ton of quartz. The De Kaap goldfields on the eastern side of the Transvaal, and about 120 miles from Delagoa Bay, were regarded as the most important, but great results were expected from those discovered later on, about 35 miles south of Pretoria. Quartz veins containing gold were also struck near Mafeking in Bechuanaland, and in Cape Colony enterprising diggers explored the district of Knysma, though, so far, the results have not been very encouraging. During the first eight months of the year, the export of gold from South Africa amounted to about 122,000*l*., whilst upwards of thirty companies, under the limited liability law of the South African Republic, were formed, with an aggregate capital of three-quarters of a million.

## II. THE CONGO: CENTRAL AFRICA: MADAGASCAR, &amp;c.

*Congo Free State.*—Few events have to be chronicled during year in connection with this new State. The directors of railway Syndicate, for a line connecting the Upper Congo to the Atlantic, drafted a Charter which, as they believed, was in complete accord with the agreement concluded in Brussels in December 1885, and submitted it in February to the Congo State Government. In April they received in reply a totally different Charter, embodying conditions which the Syndicate would not accept. After some negotiations the basis of an arrangement was arrived at, which seemed to meet the views of both parties. But in the middle of August further alterations were suggested from Brussels. These were acceded to, and the revised Charter was approved by the Syndicate. Further difficulties, however, arose in coming to a final settlement. The Congo State Government in a despatch (Sept. 12) refused to ratify the Charter drawn up in accordance with its own suggestions, declaring that its terms were not reconcilable with the obligations imposed by the Berlin Conference, and stipulating that the Railway Company must be subject to the laws of the Congo State, instead of, as originally agreed, to those of Great Britain. Under such restrictions it seemed useless to continue the negotiations, which accordingly were broken off and the Syndicate dissolved. The matter was then taken up by a group of Belgian financiers, who presented a project of their own, which was forthwith accepted by the Congo Government. Without going into the particulars of this Charter, it may be stated that the title of the company is *La Compagnie du Congo pour le Commerce et l'Industrie*, and its objects, the construction of railways or other ways of inland communication in the Congo and neighbouring territories, the institution of services for marine and river navigation, ports, docks, bonding stores, &c., and operations of agriculture, industry, public works, commerce, and finance. Its capital, which may be increased or decreased by a decision of a general meeting, was fixed at first at 1,000,000 frs. in 2,000 shares of 500 frs. each. The company is to be of international character, and consequently the co-operation of foreign capital was invited, but with partial success.

Another great navigable tributary of the Congo, known as the Koli, has been recognised during the year as a distinct river, joining the right bank of the Congo at a point between the Obangé and the Lincona. In consequence of the unhealthiness of the station it was decided to remove Leopoldville to Kinshana. Altogether the colony now counts about 30 stations along the river, including the missionary posts, which contain about 300 white inhabitants, and the construction of the railway from S. Paul de

Loanda to Ambaca, in the Portuguese Congo possessions, has been commenced.

In April the General Act of the West African Conference was ratified in Berlin by all the Conference Powers except the United States of America, and the Government of that country refused to do so on the ground that the document would impose upon international obligations at variance with its traditional foreign policy. During the same month M. de Brazza was appointed Commissary-General of the Government of the French Congo, i. e. the Government of the Gaboon and Congo.

During August a female slave took refuge in the station at Stanley Falls. Mr. Deane, the chief of the station, on being called upon to surrender her to the Arab chief, her owner, refused. The Arabs then attempted to get possession of the girl by force. The Congo State soldiers, Houssas and Bangalas, fought well for three days, but their ammunition being exhausted they refused to continue the struggle, and made their escape down the river. Mr. Deane, Lieutenant Dubois, four Houssas, and four boys then set the station on fire, and retreated along the northern bank of the Congo. Lieutenant Dubois was drowned, but Mr. Deane found shelter with some friendly natives, and was afterwards rescued by Captain Coquilhat, who commanded the station of the Bangalas.

*West Coast of Africa.*—On Dec. 24, 1885, an agreement was come to by France and Germany as to their coterminous territories on the west coast of Africa. With regard to the Gulf of Biafra, the German Government renounced in favour of France all rights of sovereignty or protectorate over the territories acquired south of the river Campo by German subjects. It promised, moreover, to abstain from all political action within a definite region, and each Power was to respect the liberty of navigation and commerce of subjects of the other on the waters of the river Campo in the portion which would remain intermediate. On the other hand, the Government of the French Republic, recognising the German Protectorate over the Togo territory, renounced the rights which it might assert over the territory of Porto Seguro, by virtue of its relations with King Mensa, as well as those over Little Popo, and recognised the German Protectorate over this territory. With respect to the Senegambia, the German Government renounced all rights or pretensions which it might assert over the territories situated between the river Nuñez and the Mallecory, especially over Cobe and Kabitai, and recognised French sovereignty in these territories.

In August the British and German Governments agreed to extend the line of demarcation which separated the districts on the Gulf of Guinea in which they were severally interested, and which had been defined early in 1885. The extended line of demarcation was to start from the point on the left bank of the



Calabar, or Cross River, where the original line terminated, was to be continued diagonally to such a point on the right bank of the river Benue to the east of Yola as might be found on examination to be practically suited for the demarcation of a boundary. The regulations as to trade in the original district would apply also to the new districts. Early in the year the Germans bombarded and destroyed Money Bimbia, because the king of that place had murdered an uncle of King Bell, who was under the protection of Germany.

*Central Africa.*—The saddest event of the year was the murder of Bishop Hannington and the massacre of many Christian converts by Mwanga, the brutal young tyrant now reigning in Uganda. They met death in a way which caused the executioner to report to the king that he had never killed men who showed such fortitude and endurance, and that they had prayed aloud to God in the fire.

The publication in England (Oct.) of a letter from Emin Bey, written by him on Dec. 31, 1885, from Wadelai, had the effect of causing deep and universal interest to be felt on his behalf. This brave administrator and scientific traveller, Austrian by birth, was appointed, by the late General Gordon, Governor of the southernmost possessions of Egypt (the equatorial provinces), and had long been supposed to be either killed or captive. It now appeared, however, that he was holding out with a handful of Egyptian troops and a band of negroes against the attacks of the Sudan rebels, but was reduced to great straits. By concentrating all his forces and surrendering the outlying stations he hoped to be able to hold out till help should arrive from the north, or, failing this, to fight his way southwards. He had actually been cut off from the civilised world since April 1883, and he neither knew of Gordon's death and the fall of Khartoum nor of the state of affairs in Uganda. Forgotten and abandoned, he had made a virtue of necessity, and through the admirable devotion of his black troops had been able to withstand the attacks of those who had treacherously occupied the province of the Sudd. Without pay or hope of reward his black men had bravely fought and maintained an unequal contest, and at last, at Amadi, after nineteen days' siege, and the last bit of powder of the last boot had been eaten, they cut a way through the midst of their foes and succeeded in saving themselves. He concluded his letter by announcing his intention of remaining at his post until he should receive authority from the Egyptian Government to relinquish it, and until he had provided for the safety of the population he had rescued from slavery. This revelation of what was passing in Equatorial Africa aroused a strong feeling that an effort should be made to rescue Emin Bey. Before the close of the year, therefore, an expedition was organised with the approval of the British Government. Funds are *guaranteed by private individuals*, and a further sum

was promised by the Egyptian Government. Above all, the services of Mr. H. M. Stanley were secured, and he arrived from the United States to organise the expedition before the year closed.

A Convention was signed at Lisbon (Dec. 30) between Portugal and Germany, fixing the boundaries of their respective territories on the south-west of Africa, and defining the regions in Central Africa where the two Powers would retain liberty of action. The central region would embrace, so far as Portugal was concerned, the whole area situated between the two Portuguese provinces of Angola and Mozambique, over both of which Germany recognised the sovereign rights of Portugal.

*Mozambique.*—A serious revolt took place in October at Inhambane, a town of 6,000 inhabitants, at the entrance of the Mozambique Channel. It appears that several tribes living near Inhambane, formerly tributary to Umzila, had been taken under Portuguese rule. On these the Portuguese imposed taxes which the natives refused to pay, and killed the collector, whereupon the murderers were arrested. The Portuguese subjects, all natives, to the number of 8,000, then marched against the Umzilas, but were outflanked and surrounded, and utterly routed. The Governor-General of Mozambique at once proceeded with all his available Portuguese soldiers to Inhambane, barricaded the place, and sent the women and children on board the ships in the roadstead. In a few days the rising was suppressed, and Portuguese authority recognised throughout Inhambane.

*Zanzibar.*—On the strength of treaties entered into between the German East African Company and some German settlers in the interior with certain native chiefs, Germany announced a Protectorate over territory lying to the west of the coast. The Sultan of Zanzibar claimed the country, and refused to recognise the German Protectorate. The influence of Great Britain was successfully invoked to prevent a collision between Seyyid Barghash and the German authorities, and on the proposition of Germany it was agreed that delimitations of the Sultan's territory should be conducted by an International Commission. The commencement of the year accordingly found a Commission, consisting of a British, French, and German representative, sitting at Zanzibar with the Sultan's assent, to define the territory over which Germany should exercise her protectorate. The Commissioners, however, failed to bring matters to a conclusion on the spot, and their sittings were adjourned to London. An agreement was finally arrived at. Under this England and Germany recognised the sovereignty of the Sultan of Zanzibar over the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, and over the islands Lamu and Mafia. The Sultan was, moreover, to have a coast-line on the continent extending continuously from the mouth of the Miningani River at the issue of the Bay of Tunghi as far as Kipini. England undertook to support Germany in her negotiations with the Sultan

the farming of the customs at the ports of Dar-es-Salaam and Ngani by the German East African Company, in return for an early payment to the Sultan. Finally, both England and Germany agreed to delimit their respective spheres of interest in East Africa, as they had done on the Gulf of New Guinea. The territory to which this agreement will apply is bounded on the south by the Rovuma River and on the north by a line which follows the course of the Tana River and of its affluents to the equator. England bound herself to make no acquisitions south of this line, to accept no protectorate, and not to counteract the spread of German influence; while Germany undertook similar counter obligations with respect to the regions north of the line. England was to use her influence to promote a friendly agreement between the Sultan of Zanzibar and the German East African Company in the matter of their conflicting claims to the Kilima-Njaro region. Germany also undertook to give her adhesion to the Anglo-French declaration of March 10, 1862, acknowledging the independence of Zanzibar.

*Madagascar.*—When the treaty with France was officially announced in Paris (Dec. 22, 1885), the general impression was that that country had secured very substantial advantages. But this was not so. The point on which all former negotiations had broken down was that of a Protectorate, which France insisted upon exercising, and which the Queen of Madagascar and her ministers as stoutly repudiated. The text of the new treaty revealed the fact that the latter had prevailed, for the word Protectorate formed no part of it. France, indeed, was “to protect” the Malagasy abroad, and to “represent Madagascar in all its foreign relations,” by a Resident at Antananarivo, under a military guard, and entitled to be received in audience by the Queen. It was, however, expressly stipulated that he was to do this without interfering in the internal administration of the country.” The commercial rights of Frenchmen, which had been the real ground of the French invasion, were put upon a satisfactory footing, though France did not secure all she expected. French subjects may now hold long leases of real property, but the Hova Government still declines to give the right of possessing land in freehold to foreigners. The indemnity question was settled by a payment of 400,000*l.*, not as a military indemnity, but as a “settlement of French claims liquidated before the war, and in compensation for the damages suffered by foreign subjects by reason of that war, and the French troops were to hold Tamatave until it was paid.” On the French Government, therefore, would fall the settlement of the losses of British and other traders, and of missionaries at Tamatave and elsewhere. The right granted to France to occupy Diego Suarez may, or may not, be a valuable concession; but in any case the Malagasy have retained their independence. Moreover, the subjects of all the Treaty Powers retained the rights and privi-

leges they possessed before the war, the new treaty in no way affecting the rights previously guaranteed by the Hova Government. It was forthwith verbally notified to the British Government through the French ambassador, who stated that its conditions would henceforth govern the relations of the Hovas with foreign countries. The port of Tamatave was again opened to the commerce of all nations, as before the war, Customs duties being retained provisionally in the hands of the French until the payment of the indemnity. M. Lemyre de Villers, formerly Governor of Cochin China, was appointed (March 9) French Resident in Madagascar, stationed at Antananarivo, and charged with the direction of the foreign affairs of the Hova Government, French consuls being subject to him as Vice-Residents. It was further arranged that Frenchmen and foreigners should be tried by the French authorities, with an appeal to the Reunion tribunal; whilst suits between Frenchmen and natives were to be tried by the Resident, or one of the Vice-Residents, assisted by a native judge. A new difficulty between France and Madagascar arose on the notification that the latter had granted to an English Syndicate a Charter for the establishment of the Royal Bank of Madagascar. The Bank in return undertook to advance 800,000*l.* at 7 per cent. on the security of the Customs duties, which were to be collected jointly by the representatives of the Hova Government and the Bank. To this proposal the French Government objected, being anxious that the Customs should be controlled by French officials, and the relations between the two Governments once more become strained. Numerous demands of an exacting nature were made on the Hova Government in connection with the internal affairs of Madagascar, and the French Government declared that the alienation of the customs, mint, and mines would not be recognised without the approval of the Resident. Just as the year was closing, it was announced in Paris that the Hova Government had set aside the arrangement with the English Syndicate, and had signed another with the Paris Comptoir d'Escompte by which the latter was to advance 600,000*l.* to the Hova Government; that the latter had given, as security, the collection of the Customs in five of its ports, in each of which the Comptoir d'Escompte would place two agents; that the 400,000*l.* due to France under the recent treaty would be paid forthwith, and that thereupon the French troops would evacuate Tamatave and withdraw to Diego Suarez.

*Mauritius.*—The official harmony of this colony has been marred during the year by serious quarrels between the Governor (Sir J. Pope Hennessy) and the Colonial Secretary (Mr. Clifford Lloyd), and matters became so strained that the latter received permission to leave the island for a time, but ostensibly for the benefit of his health, whilst Sir Hercules Robinson, the High Commissioner for South Africa, had instructions from the Home Government to proceed to Mauritius and

institute a thorough inquiry into the existing state of affairs there, and to administer the government during the progress of the inquiry. The misunderstanding between Sir J. Pope Hennessy and his subordinate came to a climax in this way. When the Council met on April 19, and the Governor, having delivered his opening speech, withdrew, the Council, under the presidency of the Colonial Secretary, drew up a reply, to which an amendment was moved by one of the members, formally approving of the Governor's past administration. A warm debate ensued, but Mr. Lloyd took the part of his chief and advised the official members to vote for the amendment, which was accordingly carried. The debate was considered so important that a report of it was forwarded to the Secretary of State with a covering despatch from the Governor. The report, however, was sent off without having been submitted to the different speakers for correction, and the Governor was charged with having "edited" their remarks. They were naturally indignant at being misrepresented in Downing Street, whilst Mr. Lloyd declared that the report made it appear that he had said exactly the reverse of what he did say. Hence the estrangement between the Governor and the Lieut.-Governor; but no action was taken by the former for more than two months, when he suddenly called upon Mr. Lloyd to explain the attitude he had taken up in Council, threatening him with suspension if the explanation were not satisfactory. The immediate effect of the quarrel was Mr. Lloyd's temporary appointment (August) to the Seychelles Islands, and the despatch of the Royal Commissioner from Cape Colony (October). The result of this investigation was the suspension (December) of the Governor upon various grounds, but chiefly because he had occasioned a breach between classes and nationalities which was not likely to heal while he remained. That the Governor's unpopularity with his Council had been growing for some time past was evident from the fact that early in the year five of the elected members, with the full concurrence of a large majority of the population, had signed a memorial to the Secretary of State praying for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into Sir J. P. Hennessy's administration. This was refused, but, in reply to the refusal, a long and serious list of grievances was prepared for the Home Government.



## CHAPTER VII.

## AMERICA.

UNITED STATES—CANADA—MEXICO—CENTRAL AMERICA—WEST  
INDIES—BRAZIL—CHILI AND PERU.

## I. THE UNITED STATES.

THE state of parties in America, as shown in the House of Representatives the second month (January 1886) of the first session of the forty-ninth Congress, was as follows: Democrats, 141; Republicans, 141; Greenback Democrat, 1.

President Cleveland, March 1, sent a long message to the Senate, defining his position on the question of the right of that body to demand papers from the Executive in regard to removals made by the President. Among the points are: that the Constitution of the United States gives to the President the sole right of removal or suspension, and that he is responsible to the people alone; that those sections of the Tenure of Office Act which directed the President to report to the Senate his reasons for suspensions have been repealed; and that the papers asked for (on which the matter in discussion arose) are not official, but personal and private, and under the full authority of the President alone.

On the following day the President sent a message to Congress touching recent Chinese outrages at Rock Springs. He did not think the United States liable, either by treaty or constitutional law, for the loss of life and property; but recommended the matter to the "benevolent attitude of Congress," and suggested that it would be a generous action on the part of the United States Government to indemnify the poor sufferers in these outrages.

On April 22 the President sent a message to Congress in which he said that he was so deeply impressed with the importance of immediately and thoughtfully dealing with the existing labour problem, involving the settlement of disputes, that he was constrained to recommend legislation on that serious and pressing subject. He referred to the claims and rights of workmen, and recommended that all legislation on the subject should be calm and deliberate, with no purpose of satisfying unreasonable demands or gaining partisan advantage. The present condition of the relations between labour and capital are, he conceded the President, unsatisfactory, and are largely due to grasping, heedless exactions of employers. The alleged discrimination in favour of capital is the object of the attention of the Government; but at the same time it must be conceded

working-men are not always careful to avoid causeless and unjustifiable disturbances. The effort of the Government to secure better accord must be limited by constitutional restrictions. There are many grievances which it cannot redress, but it is satisfied that something can be done under Federal authority to prevent frequent disputes. The President favoured voluntary arbitration, and suggested the creation of a Commission of Labour composed of three members, who should be regular Government officers charged with the settlement of controversies. President Cleveland pronounced against temporary arbitrators, and expressed the opinion that the establishment of the bureau he suggested would be a just and sensible recognition of the value of labour and its right to be represented in the departments of Government. This message may be read in connection with the Labour Arbitration Bill, which passed the House of Representatives by 195 votes to 80, modified in so far that arbitration is optional, and the Government pays the expense up to \$1,000 in each case.

One of the most important matters that occupied public attention in the United States from time to time during the year 1886, and which, at the date of the close of this record, is still awaiting the decision of the American and British Governments, is that connected with the rights of American fishermen in British North American waters. The question of those rights may be said to date from the very foundation of the Union, and its early significance is thus incidentally referred to in a despatch from Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, to Mr. Phelps, United States Minister at the Court of St. James (Nov. 6, 1886): "Mr. J. R. Livingston, the first Secretary of State appointed by the Continental Congress, in instructions issued on January 7, 1782, to Dr. Franklin, then at Paris, entrusted by the United States with the negotiation of articles of peace with Great Britain, stated the American view as follows: 'The arguments on which the people of America found their claim to fish on the banks of Newfoundland arise, first from their having once formed a part of the British Empire, in which state they always enjoyed as fully as the people of Britain themselves the right of fishing on those banks. They have shared in all the wars for the extension of that right, and Britain could with no more justice have excluded them from the enjoyment of it (even supposing that one nation could possess it to the exclusion of another) while they formed a part of that empire than they could exclude the people of London or Bristol. If so, the only inquiry is—how have we lost this right? If we were tenants in common with Great Britain while united with her we still continue so, unless by our own act we have relinquished our title. Had we parted with mutual consent we should doubtless have made partition of our common rights by treaty. But the oppressions of Great Britain forced us to a separation (which must be admitted, or we have

no right to be independent) ; and it cannot certainly be contended that those oppressions abridged our rights or gave new ones to Britain. Our rights, then, are not invalidated by this separation, more particularly as we have kept up our claim from the commencement of the war, and assigned the attempt of Great Britain to exclude us from the fisheries as one of the causes of our recurring to arms.' ”

The following is a *précis* of “the fisheries question” between the two countries, from the time of separation to the year 1886 :—The Treaty of Peace of 1783 gave American fishermen much the same power (the word “right” is one of the terms in dispute) to fish in the territorial waters of British North America which they had enjoyed before the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country. This was coupled with certain conditions and restrictions, the exact nature of which became a subject of warm dispute between the two countries when they were negotiating the treaty that followed the war of 1812. It was impossible to come to an understanding, and so all mention of the fisheries was omitted from the second treaty. American fishing vessels were excluded from Canadian waters, and trespassers were seized, much as they are now. Then came the Convention of 1818, granting American fishermen most of the powers or privileges which they had temporarily lost, on condition that they should neither take, dry, nor cure fish “on or within three marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbours” of British North America. This, apparently, was sufficiently explicit, but disputes continued. The question was mooted as to what is a bay ? And it became necessary to define the precise signification of “three marine miles.” England contended that a bay meant any bay, great or small, and that the three-mile line should be drawn from headland to headland. The United States said that it must follow the sinuosities of the coast—in all cases at least where the mouths of bays were more than six miles wide. The difference was all-important, for the British construction, when applied to the larger bays, shut out the Americans from some of the richest fishing-grounds in the world. England from time to time yielded a point, but only for peace and quietness, and not as a surrender of principle. The American fishermen fished within the larger bays, and sometimes their boats were seized and sometimes they were not.

Matters were at length put on a more satisfactory footing by the conclusion of a Reciprocity Treaty between the Dominion of Canada and the United States of America. The Americans were to enjoy the use of the Canadian and Newfoundland inshore fishings ; the Canadians were to enjoy certain privileges of free trade with the United States. This lasted from 1854 to 1865, when the Washington Government terminated the treaty on the ground that the advantages arising from it were all on the side of Canada. American fishermen still plied their calling as

efore, but they agreed to pay a compensation, and in 1877 Canada and Newfoundland were awarded a million sterling by the Mixed Commission constituted under the Treaty of Washington. But New England did not like this arrangement. The importation of fish and fish oils from British North America was supposed to be detrimental to her local interests, and she induced the Government of Washington to terminate the fisheries clauses of the treaty. The United States had already refused to negotiate a new Reciprocity Treaty with Canada; and thus the controversy remained almost where it was at the outset.

The dispute again became “a burning question” by the seizure, and threats of seizure, in the months of May, June, and July, 1886, of certain American fishing vessels in British North American ports and British North American waters by the Canadian authorities. Other causes of complaint were alleged by American fishermen against Customs and other officials of the Dominion Government. But the existing dispute turned, not upon the old controversy of the right of American fishermen to “take, dry, or cure fish” within the three-mile limit, but upon the purposes for which it may be lawful for a foreign fishing vessel to enter a Canadian port. The “purposes” for which Americans engaged in the fisheries want to enter these ports are the purchase of bait, ice, and other necessary supplies, the hiring of seamen, and the transshipments of their catch in bond to their own country. The Americans contend that they have a legal right to enter Dominion ports for the above purposes on grounds which may be thus briefly stated:—Bait for the Newfoundland banks fisheries is chiefly obtainable near to the shores of the Canadian coast, and bait is indispensable to the prosecution of deep-sea fishing. The American contention, therefore, is that as the Convention of 1818—to which the question was relegated, and upon the construction of which the points in dispute arose—was avowedly framed for the protection of the “inshore fisheries,” no infringement of that treaty is involved in the purchase of bait intended for use in the deep-sea fisheries. Further, it is declared that herring and mackerel (which are the chief product of the inshore fisheries) being no longer caught by means of bait, but by purse-seines, the procuring of bait in Canadian ports cannot in any way be associated with the taking of fish in the territorial waters, which is meant to be prevented. In 1818 herring and mackerel were taken with bait, and therefore there was at that time good reason for forbidding foreign vessels to obtain bait in the ports; but this reason no longer exists. Similarly, in former times it was necessary to land in order to dry and cure fish. This, however, is no longer the case; the use of larger vessels, and the preservation of the fish by means of ice, have wholly altered the conditions in regard to landing. The shipping of seamen intended for employment in the deep-sea fisheries comes under the same lines of contention as the

purchasing of bait, ice, and other supplies required for those fisheries. It is therefore argued by the Americans that, as the powers conferred on Canada by the Convention of 1818 are powers intended for the protection of her inshore fisheries, these powers have no right to be exercised where there is manifestly no intention of taking fish in her territorial waters. The powers are given her to protect her own fishing-grounds from violation, and Canada uses them in extending the operation of the Convention of 1818 beyond its legitimate scope by injuring the deep-sea fisheries, of which American fishermen have the right to avail themselves with the aid of all the means secured by the practices and laws of civilised international intercourse. The Canadian authorities contend, on the other hand, that the Treaty of 1818 is as efficient in every respect to-day as it was on the day when it was ratified; that it has never been modified, superseded, or abrogated in any of its parts; that, although twice suspended during the operation of other treaties, it has on the expiration of these in each case resumed its full original powers unimpaired. America, again, insists that the provisions of the Convention have from time to time been extended by trade and commercial laws made since its ratification, affecting the intercourse between the United States on the one side and Great Britain and her colonies on the other. The Imperial Shipping and Navigation Act of 1849 and other legislative enactments of both countries providing for reciprocal freedom of commerce are cited as entering vitally and largely into the interpretation of the Convention. It is, accordingly, claimed that Canada has no legal right to refuse American vessels access to her ports for purposes of trade, and that she violates international law and provokes retaliation by such refusal in cases of fishing vessels, possessing a permit to trade, which enter her ports to purchase supplies, and engage men for deep-sea fishing.

Thus the matter rested at the close of the year 1886. The whole of the facts from the American standpoint are stated in Executive Document No. 19, 49th Congress, 2nd Session, House of Representatives: "Message from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State, accompanied by the correspondence relating to the rights of American fishermen in British North American waters." In that message the President suggested that "a commission be authorised by law to take perpetuating proofs of the losses sustained during the past year by American fishermen, owing to their unfriendly and unwarranted treatment by the local authorities of the maritime provinces of the Dominion of Canada." The dispute gave rise to a good deal of acrimonious feeling, and, as will be seen below, was further referred to in the President's annual message to Congress.

During the month of August a curious controversy arose between the American and Mexican Governments concerning



conduct of an American citizen, one Cutting by name. He formerly published a newspaper in Texas, near the Mexican border. Subsequently he moved across the border, publishing a paper in Spanish. He was arrested for publishing libellous matter about the local Government, and was released upon making a retraction. As soon as he was released he crossed

Texas, had the original libel republished there in Spanish in an American newspaper, and taking copies of this paper with him returned to Mexico and sold them. He was rearrested, tried, convicted, and sentenced to imprisonment. The American Government took up the position that the offence was committed in the jurisdiction of the United States, and could not be punished in Mexico, and demanded peremptorily his immediate release. Mr. Bayard, Secretary of State, declared that: "The liberty of the citizens and of all others lawfully within our jurisdiction would be greatly impaired, if not wholly destroyed, by permitting the power of a foreign State to define offences and assign penalties to acts committed within the jurisdiction of the United States." President Diaz, on the other hand, said that the Mexican Government was acting in good faith, being only anxious of having justice done. He felt that the matter was one requiring calm consideration on the part of the two Governments, not influenced by popular clamour. Señor Rubio, the Mexican Minister of the Interior, had defended the arrest, which was in proper legal form. Mr. Cutting had been treated with more consideration than Mexican criminals, and the Mexican Government considered that he had not only infringed the code of the State of Chihuahua, making offences against its citizens committed in foreign territory punishable, but that, in evincing contempt of court, he had violated the national laws. The affair was temporarily adjusted by the Mexican Government making a proposition, through the United States Minister at Mexico, that the American Government should send a special envoy to confer with the Mexican Attorney-General as to the proper interpretation of the law in the case. The proposition was acted upon, and Mr. Arthur G. Sedgwick was deputed to act in behalf of the United States, but without diplomatic powers or authority to effect a settlement.

An Extradition Convention between Great Britain and the United States, sent to the Senate in June but not acted upon, became the subject of a good deal of criticism in the public press a week or so before Congress adjourned. The point which provoked the most discussion was that on which the extradition of a certain class of political offenders might possibly depend. A serious injury to property, whereby the life of any person might be endangered, if such injuries constitute a crime according to the laws of both the high contracting parties, was added to the list of extraditable offences. The general opinion in America may be gathered from the views of the leading American

journals, expressed as follows. The *New York Times*: "If both nations held dynamite crime to be infamous, and were moved by a common desire to prevent it altogether, they might, in full accordance with international precedent and practice, agree to surrender on demand criminals of this class conspiring or plotting in either country against the other when not clearly and certainly punishable under local laws. This description covers the case of Patrick Ford and others who, like him, have raised money in this country to be expended in infamous crimes in England." The *New York Herald*: "It [the Convention] leaves much room for mischievous controversy on more than one point, but notwithstanding its incompleteness and shortcomings it is a decided improvement. It would, at least, close Canada as a convenient refuge for plunderers, thieves, and swindlers. That alone would be a great gain to the United States." The *New York Evening Post*: "The term political offence is one no Government has ever yet allowed any other Government to define for it. All treaties and arrangements which make any mention of the matter leave it to the Government from which the surrender of the fugitive criminal is demanded to say whether the crime with which he is charged is political in its character or not. It must be left to each to decide any particular case—whether even the dynamiter is simply a reckless politician or a desperate criminal."

The first session of the forty-ninth Congress was finally adjourned August 5. The total number of Bills and joint-resolutions introduced was 13,202 (House, 10,228; and Senate, 2,974). Of these 987 were finally enacted—746 originated in the House, and 241 in the Senate. The President vetoed 115 Bills, of which 102 were private pensions, and six for the erection of public buildings. The total appropriations voted by Congress at this session were \$264,783,579, as follows: Agricultural, \$654,715; army, \$23,753,057; consular and diplomatic, \$1,364,065; District of Colombia, \$3,721,051; Indian, \$5,546,262; legislative &c., \$20,654,346; military academy, \$297,805; navy, \$12,989,907; pension, \$76,075,200; Post Office, \$54,365,863; river and harbour, \$14,473,900; sundry civil, \$22,657,510; deficiencies, \$13,960,880; *Alabama* awards, \$5,769,015; naval increase, \$3,500,000; miscellaneous, \$5,000,000.

The second session of the forty-ninth Congress began Dec. 6 with the reading of the President's usual annual message to both Houses. It commenced by declaring that no question had arisen between the United States and other nations during the past year which was beyond the reach of a friendly settlement. Regret was expressed at the cruelties committed against the Chinese in certain parts of the United States; and reference was made to the inauguration of M. Bartholdi's statue of Liberty, as giving a fresh impulse to the sympathy existing between the United

tates and France. The President urged the enactment of measures to give effect to the Convention for the protection of submarine cables.

Concerning the fisheries question, already herein referred to at length, the President said: "The present condition of affairs is scarcely realisable at the date of the negotiation of the treaty of 1818. New and vast interests had arisen, modes of intercourse between countries had been invented and multiplied, and the methods of the fisheries had wholly changed. All this is entitled to candid and careful consideration in the adjustment of the terms and conditions of the intercourse and commerce between the United States and their neighbours. Propinquity and community of language and occupation and the similarity of institutions indicate the wisdom of maintaining mutually beneficial and friendly relations. While I am unfeignedly desirous," the President continued, "that such relations should exist between us and the inhabitants of Canada, yet the action of their officials toward our fishermen has been such as seriously to threaten their continuance. Although disappointed in my efforts to secure a satisfactory settlement of the fisheries question, negotiations are still pending, with a reasonable hope that before the close of the present session of Congress the announcement may be made that an acceptable conclusion has been reached."

The Message announced that it was proposed to initiate negotiations with Mexico for a new and enlarged treaty of commerce and navigation. Referring to the Cutting affair, it declared that the admission of Mexico's claim to extra-territorial criminal jurisdiction would be attended with serious results, invasive of the jurisdiction of the United States, and highly dangerous to American citizens in foreign lands. "I, therefore," continued the President, "protested against its exercise as unwarranted by the law of international usages. The right is denied of any foreign sovereign to punish citizens of the United States for an offence committed in the States, and which is a violation of our law, even though the offence be against a foreign subject or citizen. Americans abroad must abide by the laws in force, but must have a fair and open trial. Specially strong reasons exist for perfect harmony between the United States and Mexico, and I trust, therefore, that the Mexican statute relating to the claim referred to may be so modified as to eliminate the present possibilities of danger to peace."

Regarding the financial condition of the country the Message pointed out that the income of the Government was more than ever in excess of the public necessities. All the public debt now payable would be paid if the present rate prevail within a year. If the present revenue system continued, there would be vastly more income than necessary to meet expenses, thus creating an excess which might be uselessly hoarded or lead to wasteful public extravagance. The Message argued at length that the

exaction of such a surplus resulted from a perversion of the relations between the people and the Government, and was a dangerous departure from the rules which limit the right of Federal taxation. "It has been our policy," said the President, "to collect the principal revenue by a tax on imports; no change in this policy is desirable, but the present condition of affairs constrains the people to demand a revision of the revenue laws, so that the receipts may be reduced to what is necessary to cover the expense of economical administration; and this demand should be recognised and obeyed by Congress. In readjusting the burdens of taxation we should deal cautiously with industries dependent on present conditions, and regard also the interests of American labour. I recommend, keeping in view all these considerations, that the revenue laws be amended so as to cheapen the necessities of life, and give freer entrance to raw materials. To accomplish this much-needed reform it is necessary to approach the subject in a patriotic spirit of devotion to the interests of the entire country, and with willingness to yield something for the public good."

With respect to the Land Question, the Message called attention to the rapid appropriation of the public lands for the purpose of aggregation in large holdings, often in the hands of foreigners, which, in the President's view, invited the serious and immediate attention of Congress. The President renewed his suggestion for a Labour Bureau (*see* Message, April 22, referred to above) empowered to arbitrate between employer and employed. "But," continued the President, "after all has been done by the passing of laws to relieve a situation full of solicitude, much remains to be accomplished by the reinstatement and cultivation of the true American sentiment which recognises the equality of American citizenship. This would teach that capital should generously accord labour just compensation and consideration, and that contented labour is capital's best protection and faithful ally."

The Annual Report of Mr. Manning, Secretary of the Treasury, presented to Congress Dec. 6, 1886, adverted to recent action of Great Britain in appointing a Special Commission to inquire into the practicability of international bimetallism, from which he expected important results. He did not consider, however, that the present time was opportune for the summoning of a new international conference by the United States. On the contrary, he regarded the movements going on in Europe as indicating the advisability for the American Government to suspend the coinage of silver while Great Britain and other countries were making up their minds on the subject. "If," wrote Mr. Manning, "the law was repealed which renders compulsory the purchase and coinage of silver, and that repeal were accompanied by a declaration of Congress that the United States would hold themselves in readiness to unite with France, Germany,

and Great Britain in the opening of mints for the free coinage of silver and gold at a ratio to be fixed by international agreement, it is my opinion that before the expiration of another fiscal year this international monetary dislocation might be corrected. By such international concurrence the two metals would be restored to their old universal function as the one standard measure of prices, and the depression in trade and industry would be relieved, and general prosperity would be renewed."

He advised that taxation should be reduced immediately to an annual revenue sufficing to pay the annual expenditure, including the sinking fund, but excluding the amount for silver purchases. The unfunded debt of \$346,681,016 should be paid, he was of opinion, with the present surplus, and that which will accrue before the whole reduction of taxation can be made or take effect, and while no more of the funded debt can be paid except at a premium during the five years ending 1891. Mr. Manning recommended as the first step towards the reduction of taxation the repeal of the duties on raw materials, which, he declared, prolonged unnecessarily the tariff war regarding the taxes on those articles, adding that the United States had been undersold and excluded from foreign markets.

The Annual Report of Mr. Conrad Jordan, Treasurer of the United States, showed that the revenue for the year ending June 30, 1886, amounted to \$336,439,727, and the expenditure to \$242,483,138; the revenue being \$12,749,020 greater, and the expenditure \$17,743,796 less, than in the preceding fiscal year. The report stated that there were indications that the surplus of revenue for the fiscal year ending June 1887 would amount to \$90,000,000.

During the past year strikes and labour agitations were rife in many parts of the United States, the most important of which was a strike in favour of a general law of eight hours' work per day. Many thousand hands in various trades struck, and a great demonstration was planned to take place simultaneously the first week in May in several leading cities; but it was, as an organised agitation of striked workmen, less formidable than was anticipated. The largest display was made in Chicago, where about 30,000 men quitted their work and paraded with bands of music and red flags. These were not all strikers. About 15,000 were men out for a holiday. About 7,500 were railway men and wood workers who had struck for eight hours. About as many more were labourers out of employment because their employers had closed their shops rather than yield to the eight-hour demand. All were orderly and peaceable at first, but later a mob of 7,000 of the most turbulent elements in the city, consisting largely of Poles, Bohemians, and Germans, attacked the McCormick Reaper Works, because they believed the men were working ten hours. The fact was that the demand of *eight hours had been temporarily conceded*. The mob assailed



the men with stones and broke the windows of the building. When a platoon of police arrived they were met with stones and pistols. The police stood their ground, finally routing the mob after severely injuring several. In New York there was an open air meeting in Union Square in favour of the eight hours' movement. It was attended by 20,000 men, chiefly labourers. There were many red flags and incendiary speeches, by foreign Socialists chiefly, but the crowd was quiet and orderly, and dispersed early, apparently without being much affected thereby. It became apparent that there was no skilfully organised eight hours' movement here. In other cities there were small demonstrations, but few strikes. Few concessions were made by employers, several of whom professed their willingness, rather than yield, to stop work entirely. The cause of the movement is stated to have been the belief that wages are too high, and that a general reduction was inevitable unless an organised demonstration of the labourers could be made. It was estimated that there were at least a million labourers idle in the country.

These labour agitations culminated in a formidable Socialist riot in the city of Chicago on Tuesday, May 4, in which many persons—police, citizens, and rioters—were killed and wounded. It appears that for years a small body of them, mostly Germans, had been permitted to preach openly the most incendiary doctrines without molestation. They published a German newspaper (edited by one Augustus Spies), which daily advocated anarchy. On the day preceding the outbreak it had a most incendiary appeal, containing the following passages in allusion to the strike agitation of the preceding day, above referred to:—

“A war of classes is at hand. Yesterday working-men were shot down in front of McCormick's factory whose blood cried out for revenge. Who will deny that the tigers who rule us are greedy for the blood of the working-man? But the working men are not sheep, and will reply to the White Terror with the Red Terror. Sooner death than life in misery! If the working men are to be shot at, let us answer in such a way that the robbers will not soon forget it. The murderous capitalistic beast have been made drunk by the smoking blood of our working men. The tiger is crouching for a spring. Its eyes glare murderously. It moves its tail impatiently, and all its muscles are tense. Absolute necessity forces the cry—To arms! To arms. If you do not defend yourselves you will be torn and mutilated by the fangs of the beast. The new yoke which awaits you in case of cowardly retreat is harder and heavier than the bitter yoke of your present slavery. All the powers opposed to labour have united. They see their common interest in such days as these. All else must be subordinate to one thought—How can these wealthy robbers and their hired bands of murderers be made harmless? . . . Whoever is a man must show it to-day. Men, to the front!”

This was the preliminary to a summons for a meeting in the open square called the Old Haymarket, at half-past seven in the evening. The place is capable of holding 20,000 people. It was some two hours later when the leaders came upon the ground. Augustus Spies, climbing a waggon in front of a factory, began an address denouncing capital, and saying he had not caused the previous day's riot, but it was natural, and the result of class oppression. His remarks created no enthusiasm, and the crowd began to dwindle. He was followed by another speaker, named Parsons, who, though inflammatory, caused no excitement. In the end a notorious Socialist, named Fielding, began a most incendiary harangue, becoming so violent that word was sent to the neighbouring police station, and a squad of 125 constables were marched to the square. Their leader ordered the crowd to disperse. Fielding shouted from the waggon "To arms!" The police once more ordered the people to disperse, when somebody in the mob shouted, "Kill the — — —!" Almost as soon as the words were uttered a bomb was thrown from near the stand into the midst of the police detachment. It exploded instantly, and five of the policemen fell. Others were wounded, and several Socialists also. The police retorted instantly with volley from their revolvers. The rioters answered with theirs, with which they were well provided. The mob appeared crazed with the desire for blood, and, holding their ground, poured volley after volley into the midst of the police-constables. The latter fought gallantly, and finally dispersed the mob and cleared the market-place. Large numbers of the rioters fell, but as they dropped they were immediately carried to the rear and into many of the dark alleys by their friends. The wounded and killed were removed to the neighbouring police-station, and later to the hospital. It was discovered that 36 policemen were wounded—two mortally—and four killed. One Socialist was killed. The names were ascertained of twenty-four rioters and citizens who were wounded. Spies and some of his companions were later indicted for murder, and with inciting to violence, and were convicted and sentenced, in two cases to death, in others to various terms of imprisonment.

The Irish National Convocation was held in Chicago in the second week of August, about 1,400 delegates attending from all parts of the United States and from Ireland. In course of his address to the Convention, Mr. Egan declared that, since the Boston Convention, the National Treasurer had forwarded to the National League in Ireland, and to the trustees of the Parliamentary Fund, over \$320,000. Of that \$75,000 reached the hands of Mr. Parnell on the eve of the last British and Irish elections, and the American National League had the gratification of receiving Mr. Parnell's assurance that it enabled him to win victories he could not otherwise have secured; \$100,000 *had been remitted by cable within ten days during the campaign*

ment for Ireland ; (2) that we heartily approve the course pursued by Mr. Charles Stewart Parnell and his parliamentary associates in the English House of Commons, and the expression of our entire confidence in their wisdom and their ability to achieve Home Rule for Ireland ; (3) extend our heartfelt thanks to Mr. Gladstone for his efforts on behalf of Irish self-government ; and we express our appreciation to the English, Scotch, and Welsh democracy for the support given to the great Liberal leader and his Irish policy in the recent general election."

An interesting feature of American State politics of the year 1886 was the nomination of Mr. Henry George, champion and apostle of Socialistic doctrines, by popular action for Mayor of New York. It is significant of the influence wielded in certain sections of the community that he polled nearly 68,000 votes, his opponents Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. (elected) polling 60,000 and 90,000 respectively. This startled thoughtful people, showing as it did much discontent among the labouring classes than was suspected.

This record of the American year (albeit, according to long-established precedent of this publication, it should deal with American politics) would be incomplete without mention of the alarming earthquake—or, rather, series of earthquakes at Charleston, the first and most alarming shock occurring on Aug. 31, 1886. This was felt, indeed, throughout the region of the United States between the Mississippi and the Atlantic Ocean. It was especially severe in North Carolina, reaching its climax in the city of Charleston, which caused terrible destruction. The city was wrecked.

eat. The city was for a time virtually cut off from the outer world. The rails had been twisted like threads, so that no trains could approach or leave the place. There was some prospect of mine, the principal hope of relief from such disaster lying on the seaward side. Famine was, however, happily averted by strenuous effort, and by contributions in kind from adjoining cities. These were later supplemented by considerable money donations from all parts of the world, including the United Kingdom.

The obituary of the year includes the death (Aug. 4) of Mr. Samuel J. Tilden, Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1876, when he received a large majority of the popular votes east; and of Ex-President Arthur (Nov. 19), who, on the assassination of President Garfield in 1881, filled his post for the rest of the Presidential term.

## II. CANADA.

There is little to relate of any importance in the record of Canadian politics for the year last past. The whole of the principal facts in relation to the Fisheries Question, as it affects Canada, are set forth at sufficient length in the previous chapter *United States of America, see pp. 467–70*).

A matter of some general interest was Mr. Blake's motion, made in the Dominion House of Commons (May 6), for an address to the Crown, expressing the desire of that House that some means might be found to grant local self-government to Ireland, and hailing with joy the submission by Mr. Gladstone's Government of a measure to that end. The following amendment to the resolution was moved by the Hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue: "That the Commons of Canada express a deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and adhere to the sentiments expressed in the joint address to her Majesty of both Houses of Parliament in 1882. That the Parliament of Canada then expressed the hope that, if consistent with the well-being of the empire and the rights and status of the minority, some measure of local self-government might be granted to Ireland. That in answer to such address the Secretary of State for the Colonies replied that, with respect to the questions referred to, Her Majesty will have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministry, to which all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain. That, having reference to the tenor of such answer, the Commons House of Canada does not deem it expedient to again address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that some measure will be adopted satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and preserving the integrity of the empire and the rights and status of the minority, and that this resolution be forwarded to the High Commissioner for the information of the Commons of the United Kingdom." Mr. Costigan's amendment, after long debate, was carried by 140 votes to 8.

Another matter of perhaps more local interest was the passing of resolutions by the Nova Scotia Legislature in favour of seceding from Canada. These were carried almost unanimously, six votes only being given in opposition. The Government speakers declared that the Canadian Confederation was weak and would tumble to pieces within fifteen years. The strongest argument in favour of separation was that the act would lead inevitably to a Customs union with the United States, with Nova Scotia's commercial interests were so closely connected. This was an indirect argument in favour of annexation. Coming to the vote, the *Nova Scotia Chronicle* remarked as follows: "The resolutions will inspire the hearts of our people with smothered hope. From July 1, 1867, down to the present there has been nothing to modify the feeling of resentment which the people have felt at the forced union with Canada. Every attempt to build up Canadian nationality has been the most complete miscarriage. It has been a waste of substance and resources, and Nova Scotia has suffered most of all. This fact has been driven into the minds of our people, and they have concluded far as they are concerned, that the union must be dissolved."

The provincial elections held in June 1886 turned upon this question of secession from the Canadian Confederation and reciprocity with the United States, and resulted in a victory for the Liberal party, and in favour of those two "platforms." Halifax and all the Atlantic fishing counties carrying on business relations with Boston and New York elected Secessionist candidates by large majorities. The county of Cumberland adjoining New Brunswick, and three counties in Cape Breton Island, also returned Secessionists. The selection was on Dominion issues, and the question of the fisheries and the existing relations between Canada and the United States entered largely into the contest.

The first through train on the Canadian Pacific Railway ran from Montreal on June 28 for Vancouver.

### III. MEXICO.

The foreign relations of Mexico during the year 1886, though on the whole satisfactory, have not been unattended with difficulties.

In January, public opinion in the United States was excited by the unfortunate death at the hands of Mexican soldiers of Captain Crawford, an American officer commanding a detachment in pursuit of hostile Indians. From the results of investigation there appears to be no reason to suppose that the affair was other than a deplorable accident, and that the Americans were deceived by the appearance of many Indian warriors among the American troops into thinking they were Apaches.



Another incident (see also p. 471), which occurred some months later, gave rise to still greater irritation on both sides of the Rio Grande, and at one moment seemed likely to threaten the peace of the frontier communities. An American named Cutting, editor of a small newspaper in Paso del Norte, having been sued by a Mexican for libel, was compelled by the Court to publish a retraction in his paper. A few days later he crossed the frontier, and from the American town of El Paso he repeated the libel in an American journal, returning to the Mexican side and distributing the sheet himself, for which he was arrested again at the suit of the offended person. A peremptory demand for his immediate release by the United States Government, on the ground that the offence had not been committed within the jurisdiction of the Mexican courts, gave rise to lengthy correspondence between the two Governments and to great irritation and excitement along the border. The matter was at last terminated by the withdrawal of his action by the complainant, after it had been decided in his favour by the Lower Court and had been transferred to the Court of Appeal.

The relations of Mexico with other countries have been of the most friendly nature, and various treaties and conventions have been concluded in the course of the year.

The treaty of commerce signed last year with the plenipotentiary of Sweden and Norway was ratified, and another treaty of commerce concluded quite recently with France only awaits ratification.

Treaties of extradition were also concluded with Great Britain and Guatemala, and the term of the Convention with the United States Government for the reciprocal passage of troops across the Rio Grande in pursuit of hostile Indians was extended for eighteen months.

As regards internal politics, the country has enjoyed another year of peace, the only attempt to promote a seditious movement having resulted in so complete a fiasco as to prove beyond the possibility of a doubt that the days when a military chieftain could for his own personal ends plunge the country into disorder have passed beyond recall. If a further proof of this were wanting it is to be found in the pacific settlement of the dissensions between the States of Coahuila and Nuevo Leon and the Federal Government—dissensions which ten years ago would without doubt have given rise to civil war.

The results of this ascendancy of the party of law and order are meanwhile being felt in every department of industry, and are especially shown by the increased activity in mining and agricultural enterprise in all parts of the Republic.

In the department of finance, the careful and economical management of Señor Dublan has enabled the Government to remedy in great part the deplorable condition in which the *Treasury was left by its predecessors*. Moreover, the scheme of

consolidation of the public debt, to which reference was made in last year's review, has met the acceptance of the foreign creditors, notably of the holders of bonds of the London-Mexican debt, and the rise in the value of those securities indicates a belief that every effort will be made henceforth on the part of the Mexican Government to continue the payment of interest with regularity.

An arrangement for the conversion of the British Convention Debt of 1851 is on the point of conclusion, and a Mixed Commission has been appointed for the investigation of the claims of British subjects against the Government of Mexico.

The municipality of the capital having been authorised to increase the octroi duties, with the object of providing more funds for the drainage of the Valley of Mexico, considerable activity has been shown of late in the prosecution of that most important work. Ever since the city was founded the only receptacle for its drainage matter has been the Lake Texcoco, the level of which is only one metre below that of the principal square. Of late years the depth of water in the lake has been steadily decreasing (in other words, the lake itself has been filling up with drainage matter), and a corresponding increase in the death-rate has taken place, which has at last had the effect of calling the serious attention of the authorities to the necessity for immediate action. The plan of drainage which has for many years past been the object of desultory study, and which has at last been definitely adopted, is to pierce a tunnel through the range of hills which form the northern boundary of the valley, by which a fall of many hundreds of feet will be gained. By utilising the waters of the three other lakes, which are on higher levels than Texcoco, a complete current can be obtained, and the city drains be flushed as often as necessary. The estimated cost of the work is from four to five millions of dollars, and various propositions from foreign syndicates to carry it through within a specified time are under consideration.

Railway construction was not very active during the year, but certain modifications have been recently made in the concessions granted to the Central and National Railway Companies, which it is expected will have the effect of facilitating their raising the necessary funds to complete their systems on the lines originally proposed. In regard to the latter company, it is understood that an arrangement has been come to with Messrs. Matheson & Co. in London, by which the necessary capital will be procured to finish the gap between the northern and southern ends of the trunk line. When this is effected the railway communication between New York and Mexico will be shortened by nearly two days.

Considerable activity was displayed during the year in the surveying of Government lands, and it is officially stated that in *Chihuahua* and Lower California alone upwards of fifteen millions of acres have been located, and are available for sale

While doubtless a large proportion of these lands may be of little value, owing to scarcity of water, the subject is well worthy the attention of capitalists.

In the early part of the year, the Mexican Transatlantic Steamship Company having failed to meet its engagements, the steamers belonging to it were seized for debt and sold, and the company itself was obliged to go into liquidation. The Government subsequently granted a concession to the Spanish Transatlantic Steamship Company under which, in consideration of certain services, they are to receive \$5,000 for each round trip, and 2 per cent. of the duties recoverable on the cargo brought. This has created some stir in diplomatic circles, as it is held to be an infringement of the treaty rights of those countries which can claim the treatment of the most favoured nation.

The year 1886 will long be remembered in Mexico for the visit of Adelina Patti, who, with the famous contralto, Madame Calchi, and other artists, arrived at the end of December, and gave a series of semi-operatic concerts. The success attending her trip may in future attract other stars when visiting America to finish their journey as far as Mexico.

Apropos of Patti's visit may be mentioned a most audacious fraud which was perpetrated in her name by a man, supposed to be an American, who, representing himself to be her agent, Mr. Mayer, arrived in Mexico in the early part of December, and engaged the National Theatre for her concerts. For three days there was a rush to purchase tickets for the performances was unprecedented, until at last, suspicion having been aroused by various rival circumstances, the false Mayer was notified by the authorities that he was expected to deposit the money he had received in the National Bank. Taking advantage of the fact that it was past bank hours, he made a feint of compliance by depositing (without counting) a considerable quantity of silver dollars and bank notes of small value in the hands of the administrator of the hotel where he was stopping, and decamped the same night, taking with him by far the greater part of the receipts, amounting to over \$20,000. It is needless to say he has not been heard of since.

A review of the events of the year would not be complete without some allusion to the increased number of social entertainments, notably the balls at the English Legation, the Jockey Club, and the College of Mines, which, while they point to an increase of wealth, show also an awakening from the apathy in all matters relating to social intercourse which succeeded the fall of the empire and had continued up to the previous year.

## IV. CENTRAL AMERICA.

Apart from the general interest felt in the progress of the Panama Canal there is not much to be recorded. The Congress of 1885, which met to reunite the Central American Republics, and which was presided over by the designs of General Barrios in 1885, succeeded in its object, harmony was completely restored, and the Congress closed in January. The new federal constitution for the United States of Colombia, henceforth to be known as the Central American Republic, which was elaborated at the federal city of Bogotá, invested the President with unusual powers. Departments were to take the place of sovereign States, and to have their governors appointed by the central executive, those of Panama and Colon being directly appointed by the President. In September a Commission was formed, with the Government as umpire, to settle the disputed boundary between the United States of Colombia and Costa Rica, followed (Sept. 6) by the ratification of an extradition treaty between the Republic of Guatemala and Great Britain. The feeling in favour of the Nicaragua Canal across the isthmus held its ground, and there was good reason to believe that it would begin early in 1887. In the matter of the finances an improvement showed itself. A group of capitalists offered during the autumn to lend the Nicaraguan Government \$1,440,000 for the purpose of paying the interest on the Obligations of the State, as well as the Treasury Bill, on the security of a mortgage on the railroad receipts.

On the other hand, M. de Lesseps failed to secure the support or sympathy of American commercial circles for his project. Whatever faith they may have in the achievement of the object inclines to the Nicaraguan scheme, for the United States authorities have concluded a convention with those of Guatemala by which they secured for a certain period the right to construct a canal through the territory of the latter. Hereby they forestalled M. de Lesseps, a part of whose project was to obtain from the Nicaraguan Government a concession which would prevent competition of any other company between the two oceans. The French, however, were more successful in obtaining a controlling interest in the Panama railway—a line  $47\frac{1}{2}$  miles in length, running from Aspinwall on the Atlantic to Panama on the Pacific, and which has raised its annual number of passengers from 22,110 to 304,000 in 1885—now the great commercial highway between Western Europe and Eastern Asia.

The divergences of opinion as to the date of the completion of the Panama Canal remain as great as ever. M. de Lesseps fixes the opening for traffic positively in 1889, whilst

and others, looking to the difficulty of cutting through the Dulebra rocks and the unsolved engineering problem as how best to divert the Chagres River, maintain that at least two or three years more will be required. In the isthmus there is manifest advance and improvement. The dense jungle between Colon and Panama has been cleared away, and the face of the country entirely changed. The victualling, too, has ceased to offer difficulties, for the Chinese, 6,000 in number, sober, active, and attentive, have taken it in hand, and supply the want of 15,000 navvies with punctuality and cheapness. The whole system of administration has, moreover, been modified under new contractors and new engineers. But there still remains the difficulty of raising 600 millions of francs, which are indispensable for the completion of the work: it is, however, expected that the requisite amount will be obtained in France.

The net expenditure from the beginning of the canal enterprise to June 30, 1886, has been 18,840,000*l.*, the amount of shares and bonds being 28,480,000*l.*, and leaving, therefore, a balance of 9,640,000*l.* The mortality among the navvies during the year to March 31, 1886, was 5½ per cent., which was not in excess of the average mortality amongst men employed in French public works, but the company had been unfortunate in losing two engineers as well as a leading contractor from yellow fever. Accounts varied considerably as to the work actually done. The total amount of ground originally to be excavated was estimated at 100,000,000 cubic yards, of which nearly half was rock. For this the cost was estimated at 34,000,000*l.* by the Technical Commission, and 20,500,000*l.* by the contractors. As M. de Lesseps asked for 24,000,000*l.* during the month of August, when the accounts showed that 19,000,000*l.* had already been expended, it is easy to see which estimate is nearer the mark.

## V. WEST INDIES.

*Jamaica.*—Here, as in the other West India islands, the low price and consequent decline of sugar, the staple product, have induced great and general depression. There is hardly any money in circulation, and little business done; large stocks of goods are on hand, but there are few purchasers. Early in the year the Legislative Council passed a scheme of retrenchment by which a saving of 7,474*l.* was effected, and, unlike most official reorganisations, it proposed to deal with all ranks of the administration. The salary of the Governor is to be reduced by 750*l.*, that of the Chief Justice by 500*l.*, of the Postmaster by 200*l.*, of the Attorney-General by 300*l.*, of the Colonial Secretary by 100*l.*, &c.

*Trinidad.*—The outlook with regard to the sale of Crown lands at the beginning of the year was not hopeful, there being



only 19 applicants for 255 acres, as against 70 for 805 acres the previous year. As the colony depends principally upon receipts for land sales for its revenue, which during the last years have realised upwards of 100,000*l.*, to cover the loss on working of the railway, it was feared the Government would be driven to offer the railway and stock for sale to some enterprise company. The estimates for 1886 showed a probable deficit of 10,344*l.* The extension of the railway system throughout the island was proposed to the Government by a Mr. Pile, and his plan was accepted on the understanding that it should be commenced within three years and completed within ten.

*Grenada.*—The chief event of the year was the visit of an expedition (Aug. 29) sent by the Royal Society to make observations during a total eclipse of the sun. Among matters of local interest for the year may be mentioned the appointment of natives to temporary seats at the Legislative Council Board, the permanent enlargement of that body, and the establishment of parochial boards. Loans to the extent of 50,000*l.* were issued in respect of public works, and various Government offices abolished.

*St. Vincent.*—This island was visited on August 16 by a terrible hurricane, which devastated Kingstown and the south of the island, and did damage to the extent of 30,000*l.* There were 4 deaths, 5 churches and from 500 to 600 houses wrecked, many people left homeless, thousands of nutmeg, breadfruit, and other valuable trees destroyed, and the roads generally torn up. For two days the rivers were impassable, and the highways so blocked with trees that no report of the damage could be made.

*West Indies.*—The following figures are for the year 1885 and are taken from the Governor's Official Reports, published during this year:—

	Revenue. £	Expenditure. £
Antigua . . . . .	41,957	41,603
Bahamas . . . . .	45,466	44,763
Barbados . . . . .	145,758	146,134
Bermuda . . . . .	28,693	29,396
British Honduras . . . . .	52,246	63,235
Dominica . . . . .	17,094	16,927
Grenada . . . . .	42,942	45,151
Jamaica . . . . .	504,718	470,353
Montserrat . . . . .	5,069	5,277
St. Kitts and Nevis . . . . .	35,443	41,431
St. Lucia . . . . .	38,493	43,738
St. Vincent . . . . .	23,857	31,344
Tobago . . . . .	10,826	12,031
Trinidad . . . . .	429,307	443,920
Turks and Caicos Islands . . . . .	7,262	7,076
Virgin Islands . . . . .	1,753	1,926

*British Guiana.*—This colony has been passing through a severe crisis, owing to German and other Continental countries fostering the production of beet sugar by means of bounties, so that it is difficult to continue the production of cane sugar at current prices. In October notice was given by the

Government that, as the boundary line between British Guiana and Venezuela was in dispute, no right or title to land within the territory claimed by the British Government and purporting to be derived from any representative of the Venezuelan Government would be recognised, and that any person taking possession of any such land would be liable to be treated as a trespasser. As gold is known to exist in this part of the country, the rival claims of the colony and of Venezuela are intelligible.

## VI. SOUTH AMERICA—BRAZIL—ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

*Brazil.*—The result of the general election by which the new year was inaugurated was a victory for the Conservatives, thereby reversing the previous position of parties. The great question at issue had been the emancipation of the slaves, and candidates of extreme abolitionist views were, as a rule, defeated, prominent amongst them being Señor Nabuco, who attributed his defeat to the free negroes voting for the slavery flag. The new Parliament was opened (May 3) by the Emperor in person. A month later, Dantas, the ex-Premier, introduced a measure for the complete emancipation of the slaves at the end of five years. This Bill, however, after being reported on by a Special Committee, was thrown out by the Chamber, but the Abolitionists were more successful in passing a Bill putting an end to the official flogging of slaves. The estimated receipts for the fiscal year 1886–87 were fixed at 132,881,600 milreis from the existing taxation, supplemented by new imposts of 10 reis per litre on salt and 50 reis on alcoholic liquors manufactured in the country, where not made on plantations from their own products. The Government was also authorised to revise the tariff and consolidate the surtaxes with the schedule taxes, to regulate the stamp duties, and otherwise to make such modifications in taxation as were calculated to augment the Treasury receipts. The estimated expenditure was fixed at 154,654,824 milreis. Early in March a new loan of 6,000,000*l.* at 5 per cent. was issued in Europe, the price being 95, and the response was highly satisfactory, as the applications covered the sum required many times over. A new internal loan was also issued (April 2) at Rio for 5,000,000*l.* at 5 per cent., the price being 95½. The whole of this sum also was covered on the day of issue, showing that confidence in the national credit at home stood quite as high as in Europe. By this last operation a corresponding portion of the 6 per cent. internal debt was converted into 5 per cent., representing a saving to the Brazilian Government of 300,000*l.* per annum. This materially relieved the strain on Brazilian finances, and, in combination with the notable advance in the value of coffee, caused the rate of exchange to rise steadily.

*Argentine Republic.*—The most important political event of the year has been the election of Dr. Juárez Celman as President

of the Republic on the expiration of General Roca's tenure of office. His strongest opponent was Dr. Dardo Rocha, who was supported by the provincial party in Buenos Ayres, and it was feared there might be a serious intestine struggle, but the election passed off quietly, and Celman was duly installed President in October. He announced that his policy would be to maintain peace at home and abroad, and to encourage the gradual development of the country by supporting its industries and institutions. General Roca, the outgoing President, received a popular ovation from thousands of persons, who accompanied him from the presidential house to his private residence. The beginning of the year found the Republic in a difficult financial position. Dr Pelligrini, Vice-President, had been for some time in Europe, endeavouring to make arrangements with respect to the various Argentine loans; and early in the year it was announced that a new loan for 4,048,000*l.* had been issued at 85½, the bonds bearing 5 per cent. interest. On the 1st of April, 1,933,300*l.* was issued for the Provincial Government of Buenos Ayres, being the balance of the loan for 4,098,300*l.* authorised by the Act of Congress in 1881, the price of the new issue being 88 at 6 per cent. and applications for more than 3,000,000*l.* were sent in. Later in the year a second loan for the province of Buenos Ayres was brought out in Berlin for 2,500,000*l.*, and covered several times over. Other provincial loans were issued, making altogether a total of about 14,000,000*l.* during the year on Argentine account. There has been no pause in railway-making, for the extension of the Buenos Ayres Great Southern Railway to Mar del Plata has been completed, and the Buenos Ayres and Rosario Railway opened to the latter important river-port, as well as the Buenos Ayres and Pacific Railway from Mercedes to Villa Mercedes in San Luis. Arrangements have also been entered into for constructing an extension line from Mercedes into the city of Buenos Ayres, and a company formed for connecting Buenos Ayres and Valparaiso by means of an interoceanic railway. The discovery of gold in Patagonia has been a sensational event, but opinions vary considerably as to its value. The year, prosperous in other respects, was clouded by an outbreak of cholera, which greatly interfered with intercourse both at home and abroad by the rigid quarantine restrictions, and was still raging at the close of the year in Buenos Ayres, Rosario, Cordova, and other places in the interior.

*Uruguay.*—The year has been certainly an eventful one for this country. In March there was an invasion by a revolutionary army that had been organised in the Argentine Republic by General Arredondo, but the rebels were completely routed by the Government troops under General Tajes. This outbreak, and exaggerated rumours about the elections, sent the unified bonds down to 38, but by the end of the year they had risen again to 44. The elections resulted in the appointment of Dr. Vidal e

President, with General Santos as President of the Senate. The former soon retired from ill-health, and was succeeded by General Santos; but things did not go smoothly, and an unsuccessful attempt was made to assassinate him as he was entering the theatre at Monte Video. The wound he received so affected his general health that he soon after resigned the Presidency, and sailed for Europe to seek medical advice. General Tajes, the War Minister, succeeded to the Presidency, and formed a Coalition Ministry, which was regarded as conciliatory to all parties. Railways have been making steady progress, the Central Uruguay Railway having been prolonged to Rio Negro, and having acquired the Hygueritas line. The North-Western Railway was advancing rapidly to effect a junction with the Brazil-Great Southern line at the Cuarahem River; and the North-Eastern Company undertook the extension of the Pando Railway to Maldonado. The situation of this Republic has altogether improved during the year.

#### VII. PERU—CHILI—PARAGUAY—VENEZUELA.

*Peru.*—At the close of 1885 Peru was in the throes of civil war, and soon after the opening of the new year the forces under General Caceres obtained a sudden and unexpected triumph over those of the Iglesias Government. Lima surrendered, Caceres formed a Provisional Government, and the troops of both sides held the city so as to allow a general election to be held. The result was that Caceres was unanimously elected President of the Republic, and took office on March 20. The country appears to be gradually recovering from the severe shocks received during the prolonged war with Chili, and the interne-cine struggles which followed. There have been several ministerial changes, but none to affect the stability of the Government. The Budget for 1886–87 shows a deficit of \$3,000,000.

*Chili.*—In this country Señor Don Manuel Balmaceda has been elected President, in the place of Señor Santa Maria, whose term of office had expired. Some rioting took place at the elections in Santiago, but on the whole they passed off quietly, and as the new President is a statesman of liberal and progressive tendencies it is expected that the country will thrive under his administration. At present she is suffering from the depreciation in value of nearly every article she produces, so the rate of exchange continues unfavourable. In November Messrs. Rothschild & Sons effected an important operation for the Chilean Government by converting the majority of the Chilean foreign loans, which bore from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 6 per cent. interest, into a unified debt at  $4\frac{1}{2}$ , and also considerably reducing the sinking fund. By this operation it is estimated the country will make an annual saving of 94,390*l.* *Chili* has also recently made a settlement with the German and Italian holders of nitrate bonds granted

by Peru, on the basis of paying off these bonds of 185*l.* at 105*l.*, and the bondholders seem well satisfied with the arrangement. Railway development has been steady, but not very active; the Southern line has been prolonged for a considerable distance into Araucania, and a concession has been granted to a French company to construct a line from Calena to Oralle. The international tribunals for the settlement of war claims sate frequently during the year, but, difficulties arising between the various representatives, the arbitration was suspended.

*Venezuela.*—The event of the year for this Republic was the return of General Luzman Blanco, called by the general voice of his fellow-citizens to the presidency for the third time. Since he has held office a marked improvement is visible in public affairs, especially in finance. The external debt of the country is now B67,739,437, and the internal B39,666,969, and interest has been paid regularly for fourteen years. The public peace has been undisturbed, and the present Government seems strong and popular. Great activity is being displayed in developing the resources of this rich country, and, next to the Argentine, it may be regarded as the most progressive republic of South America. A claim was made on the Government by Great Britain for compensation due to the owners and crews of the ships *Henrietta* and *Josephine* for their illegal seizure in 1883, and the personal ill-treatment of their crews and passengers. The Venezuelan Government declined to admit the validity of the claims, and a further communication was therefore made to them at the end of the year, which, it was hoped, would induce them to reconsider their decision.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### AUSTRALASIA.

I. AUSTRALIA.—The occupation of the New Hebrides by the French, which had early excited public attention, became the prominent subject of discussion in these regions as soon as the publication of a German White-book revealed the existence of a Franco-German agreement whereby Germany seemed to acquiesce tacitly in the eventual annexation of the islands by France. Encouraged by this passive support, the latter offered to discontinue sending convicts to the Pacific, if the British Government would also give its consent to a French occupation of the islands. As this proposal would meet the views of the Australian Colonies on the vexed question of the deportation of French convicts to the Pacific, the British Government found in it a basis for negotiation, and agreed to consider the proposal on three conditions: (1) that it provided full protection and



edom for religion and for trade in the New Hebrides ; (2) that was accompanied by the cession of the island of Rapa ; and (3) at the opinion of the Australian Colonies should first be obtained. The verdict of the Colonial Governments, however, was against the islands passing into the hands of France on any consideration. This decision was forthwith communicated to the French Government, and the firmness with which the British Government resisted the overtures of the French Ministry for ever to gain a permanent footing in the New Hebrides gave the greatest satisfaction throughout the Australian Colonies. Lord Rosebery, in his official despatch to the French Government, while recognising its arrangements as conciliatory, stated that, in view of the fact of the Colonies being so strongly opposed to them, " Her Majesty's Government is unable to consent to any departure from the present understanding between Great Britain and France, by which the two countries are bound to respect the independence of the New Hebrides." Scarcely was this matter decided when it transpired that a French force of 200 infantry and 60 artillery had been despatched from New Caledonia to the New Hebrides, where they hoisted the French flag, and established military posts at Port Havannah and Port Sandwich. When an explanation being asked for, the French Premier stated that troops had only been sent there for the protection of French subjects, that the step had no political significance, and that there was no question whatever of occupying the islands. With this assurance, which was repeated four days later, and the promise that France held herself bound by her agreement with England to respect the independence of the New Hebrides, the British Government had to be satisfied. The Australians, however, were by no means appeased, and felt great irritation at the prolonged stay of the French troops. They considered, therefore, that France was not acting straightforwardly in the matter, for at first it had been denied that the French flag had been hoisted at all, and, when the evidence of sight became too strong for such an assertion, it was contended that it was not hoisted with any view to annexation. Moreover, the troops were not engaged on work for which they were ostensibly sent—viz. the protection of French subjects, for there were none in need of it either at Port Havannah or Port Sandwich. Two French subjects had been killed at Port Stanley, and earlier in the year the representatives of a French trading company ; but British and German subjects had suffered equally, and their Governments did not think it necessary to despatch troops for their protection. Yet, in spite of the official assurance that the island could be evacuated without delay, Port Havannah and Port Sandwich continued to be occupied by French troops, and in July additional material and stores were sent, which scarcely seemed keeping with an early withdrawal. In New Caledonia the occupation was regarded as tantamount to annexation, the press

of Noumea congratulating the French authorities on having done what the French Premier declared they had not done, had not thought of doing, and would not be permitted to do. The distrust of the intentions of the French Government was not diminished when it was announced (Aug. 20) that H.M. gunboat *Raven*, which had recently been cruising among the New Hebrides, had found the French troops still engaged in building huts at Havannah Harbour and Port Sandwich. A little later (Sept. 9) came further news that the French Hebrides Company had taken possession of land belonging to the Native Christian Mission, and was trying to dispossess a British subject of land he had held for many years, and was demanding compensation and threatening to burn the native Christian houses for imaginary outrages.

At the end of October the French troops still lingered, constructing roads at the ports and erecting substantial buildings, and the year closed without any change in the situation. Meanwhile public feeling in Australia was further irritated by the announcement from Paris that 500 more convicts were on the way to New Caledonia, already filled to overflowing with French felons; it was certain that escapes to the mainland of Australia would be numerous. Threats, too, were uttered that if the French Government would not exercise closer supervision over its criminals it would be necessary for the Australian Colonies to protect themselves by having all vessels searched, so as to prevent the landing of such unwelcome visitors.

The strong desire evinced by the Australian Colonies that their ships of war should be permitted to fly the white ensign was gratified in the course of the year. Lord Granville stated that, though this privilege might be a matter of sentiment, it was flattering to the Mother Country, and one of those small links which in a way strengthen the feeling of the union of Imperial interests. Optimists of a more prosaic nature held that this tardy concession might possibly pave the way to the acceptance of a proposal by New South Wales and Queensland to enter into a naval league with the Mother Country—a proposal to which the Governments of South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand have all more or less agreed. The joint action for military defence throughout all parts of the empire also made progress during the year, and the Australian Colonies testified their willingness to share the cost of fortifying King George's Sound and the Torres Straits. In October Admiral Tryon's scheme of defence for the Australian Colonies was made public, after having been submitted to a conference of colonial premiers. With the consent of the Admiralty it was laid on the table of the Victoria Legislative Assembly. According to this scheme the existing local forces were to be maintained and special seagoing vessels provided at the cost of the Colonies and manned by the Admiralty, their status being in all respects

same as that of Her Majesty's ships. The entire cost of equipping and maintaining these vessels was to be borne by the colonies, and it was also proposed to build five cruisers of the *Cher* class and some fast torpedo boats. The Governments of New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland held, however, the view that the cost of providing and manning the additional vessels should be borne by the Imperial Government, but that the Colonies should pay for their maintenance on the basis of the population.

A conference of the Postmasters-General of the Australian colonies, held at Melbourne (December), having in view increased facilities for the mail and telegraph systems at a reduced cost, decided to urge the Imperial Government to obtain concessions from France and Italy for the transit of the mails. It was also agreed that the Government of Victoria should make representations to the Indian Government with a view to modifying its transit charges on telegrams.

In Melbourne the indignation at the treatment of the colonial wine-growers at the Colonial Exhibition was so great that it was determined to withdraw the whole of the Victorian wines from the exhibition. Timely representations, however, in the proper quarter were successful in removing the cause of complaint, and appeasing the Australian wine-growers.

*New South Wales.*—When the year opened Parliament had adjourned for the re-election of Ministers whom Sir John Robertson had selected for his Cabinet. Sir Henry Parkes and seven others, who from their experience would have made suitable colleagues, declined to form part of the Robertson Cabinet, which was consequently composed of the Premier's personal friends. The moment of their taking office was unpropitious, the Colony, like the Mother Country, found itself in an unsatisfactory condition, due to commercial depression, unfavourable seasons, and an incongruous political situation. The finances were also in a state of embarrassment, arising out of the land question, which was a still more serious difficulty. There was, however, nothing in the situation to justify the feeling of despondency which prevailed, and there were already signs of a more healthy growth in the exchequer, when the Colonial Treasurer (Mr. J. F. Burns) made his financial statement (Feb. 4), and announced the deficit for the year 1885 to have been 1,269,000*l.* To meet this he proposed fresh taxation of a penny in the pound on the capital value of all real estate, on goods in warehouses and stores, and on the capital of banks and dividend-paying companies. The additional revenue thus accruing to the Treasury he estimated at 500,000*l.* per annum, whilst alterations in the stamp duties would yield a further 50,000*l.* He stated also that the Government would require a cash loan for public works during the year. Within a fortnight the *Legislative Assembly* passed a resolution by a small majority

condemning the policy of the Government, the proposed financial scheme being considered quite untenable and contrary to the best interests of the Colony. The Ministry thereupon resigned, and Sir Patrick Jennings was charged with the formation of a new Cabinet. At first, in conjunction with Sir John Robertson, he attempted to form a Coalition Ministry, which should include the leading men of both parties, but the negotiations fell through. In the new administration Sir P. Jennings undertook the joint duties of Premier and Treasurer, and early in April made his financial statement. He announced a policy of retrenchment and economy, and presented estimates of expenditure for the current year reduced by more than 500,000*l.* He proposed fresh taxation in the shape of a halfpenny in the pound on unimproved land exceeding 1,000*l.* in value, and of 4*d.* in the pound on incomes exceeding 300*l.* In addition to the existing specific duties, new duties to the extent of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* were to be imposed on articles up to that time on the free list, and additional stamp duties were to be levied. The new taxation was expected to yield upwards of 1,000,000*l.* per annum, and in this case the deficit would be thereby extinguished within two years. The Premier further stated that the Government would abstain from borrowing until the end of the year. In reply, a vote of censure was moved by Sir Henry Parkes against the Government for their financial proposals, but it was defeated by a majority of 44, and the financial policy of the Government endorsed without a further division. A few days later Sir H. Parkes, nothing daunted, made another attack on the financial policy of the Government, but was again beaten by 52 to 17. The Bill authorising a grant of 10,000*l.* to Sir John Robertson on his retirement from public life at the age of 72, and in recognition of his long, distinguished, and patriotic services, was read a second time, and passed through Committee without debate. Other Bills were not allowed to pass so easily. There was a protracted fight over the Customs duties, involving a continuous sitting of eighty hours, but the Government came out of it successfully with a majority of 17 in a House of 77 members. The sitting had been occasionally suspended to allow of refreshment, and might have been protracted indefinitely, had not the Opposition, headed by Sir H. Parkes, retired in a body at midnight on Saturday, protesting against sitting on Sunday (July 11). The Government took the opportunity of their absence to pass all the clauses of the Bill up to the 17th, leaving the schedule to be considered. During this prolonged sitting there were scenes of great disorder, three members were suspended, and it was found necessary to clear the strangers' gallery, which was unoccupied during most of the debate. One of the suspended members, a Mr. Wisdom, who had been Chairman of Committees, disputed the Speaker's ruling on a question of procedure, defied him, and, after being thrice called to order, was

on the Speaker's fiat and without any vote of the House. Opposition shortly after submitted a motion that the Speaker's action in suspending a member on his own authority without any motion submitted to the House was contrary to the rights of the House and a breach of privilege. The Government defeated the motion by a majority of seven, but Mr. Wisdom determined to refer the matter into the Supreme Court, and fixed his damages

though during the winter the rise in the price of wool, following upon the break-up of a prolonged drought, restored hope to sheep farmers, the higher rents they were called upon to tender the new Land Act left them in a scarcely bettered position. They, therefore, set about bringing pressure to bear upon the Government and public opinion to obtain a reduction of their rents and compensation for improvements on expiration of their twenty-one years' leases. Not satisfied with defeat on the Customs Bill, Sir H. Parkes resumed the debate (July 14) by a motion to test the ruling of the Speaker on the validity of the continuous sitting. He endeavoured to show that the Speaker's ruling in favour of continuous sitting in Committee was inconsistent with the practice of the House and standing Orders, but Sir P. Jennings contended that the Speaker's ruling was consistent with a right understanding of the rights and usages of Parliament, was warranted by precedent, and was necessary to protect the due course of public business without infringing the rights of minorities. The House took this view of the question, and after an animated debate Sir H. Parkes's motion was negatived by 54 to 33. Later on in the session the Government got into difficulties over some of their Bills. The Land Tax, after having been reduced in the Assembly from 4*d.* to 1*d.*, and having been further opposed, the Bill was ultimately rejected by the House, and this also entailed the withdrawal of the Land Tax Bill. Under these circumstances Sir P. Jennings announced that the probable deficit at the end of the year would be about 2,000,000*l.*, mainly in consequence of non-receipt of revenue from sales of Crown lands.

Subsequent Parliamentary proceedings were marked by a series of violent episodes. The discussion on the additional duties led to an all-night sitting, marked by great disorder. On this occasion Sir H. Parkes described the Ministry as "a bunch of rascals," and Mr. Wisdom indorsed the expression. The Speaker ruled that the latter's conduct was disorderly, and, on his refusal to apologise, he was forcibly removed from the Chamber.

The Government then moved the expulsion of Sir H. Parkes, but their motion was defeated by a majority of two. He was absent during the discussion of the motion, but returned to the House amid great cheering as soon as the numbers were announced, and moved that Mr. Wisdom, who had mean-



while been in the custody of the officers of the House, should be released, and this was agreed to. After much debate a Bill providing for a loan of upwards of 3,000,000*l.* and the Appropriation Bill for 1886 passed both Houses, and Parliament was prorogued (Oct. 25) by the Governor (Lord Carrington). After reviewing the work of the session he expressed his belief that the Colony was about to enter a new era of prosperity. Concerning revenue, he stated that the receipts from the Customs and the Stamp Act fully equalled the expectations that had been formed, adding that the taxation measures not passed during the session would, together with a scheme of retrenchment in the public service, be brought forward directly after the reassembling of Parliament. In the course of the session Sir P. Jennings had laid before Parliament proposals for the celebration of the centenary of New South Wales, in January 1888. He proposed that a Carnival Season of fifteen days should be proclaimed from Jan. 23, 1888, the anniversary of the first landing in the Colony of Governor Phillip, until Feb. 7, the anniversary of the formal proclamation of the Colony. A variety of fêtes and ceremonies was also included in the official programme. The Government, moreover, proposed inviting the Prince of Wales and other members of the Royal Family to be present, and also a number of distinguished men, eminent in politics, literature, art, and science, the Governors of the Australian and other dependencies of Great Britain, &c. This ambitious programme, however, failed to secure general support, and the resolution embodying it was rejected by the Assembly by 31 to 17. The Chief Justiceship of the Colony having become vacant by the death of Sir James Martin, the Premier offered the vacant post to Mr. Salomons, Q.C., by whom it was accepted, the country warmly approving the appointment. Hearing, however, that the approval of the country was not shared by the three Puisne Judges, Mr. Salomons reconsidered his acceptance, and resigned the post after three days' tenure, the Premier in vain urging him to retain it.

The Ministry, having weathered the storm of the Parliamentary session, might have fairly anticipated some rest during the recess. But a deputation of sixty persons waited upon the Governor (Nov. 20), and presented a petition, said to have been signed by 20,000 persons, praying for a dissolution of Parliament, on the ground that it had ceased to represent the country. The Governor replied that, seeing Parliament was only one year old, that the Government had commanded an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives on every test division, and that there was no difference of opinion between himself and his responsible advisers on any great State question, he must decline to take the step asked for. The feeling, however, which underlay their demonstration was too important to be ignored; and the Government at once set itself to carry out that policy of

renchment which had been so frequently promised and as  
quently adjourned.

It was decided that large reductions should be made in the  
litary forces of the colony. The permanent artillery was to  
reduced from 850 to 350, the 500 discharged being formed  
o a reserve force; the volunteer artillery from 985 to 462 ;  
e engineers' corps from 121 to 100 ; the torpedo corps from  
8 to 160 ; and the infantry from 3,812 to 2,053. In this way  
aving on next year's estimates of 44,000*l.* would be effected ;  
ilst changes in the reserve corps would make a further saving  
12,500*l.*, and in the naval brigade of 2,414*l.* Economies in  
e Civil Service were also foreshadowed, but they pointed rather  
increased hours of attendance than to any actual lowering of  
e salaries.

*Victoria.*—The financial condition of this colony showed  
ms of continued prosperity. The revenue for 1885 amounted  
6,250,000*l.*, giving a net increase of 60,000*l.* on the pre-  
ding year, due to railway revenue. The actual increase from  
is source alone was 73,000*l.*, proving that the colony had been  
stified in expending so large a proportion of its recent loans  
railway works. Harvest operations were nearly over by the  
st week in January, and it was estimated there would be  
,000 tons of wheat available for export. The yield of gold in  
e colony in 1885 amounted to 784,000 ounces, being a small  
crease on that of the preceding year. Two hundred and twenty  
les of railway were in course of construction, and 250 more  
re projected. Works of irrigation covering a vast area, and  
imated to cost 1,300,000*l.*, were also sanctioned. In politics,  
e principal event was the announcement made early in the  
ar by Mr. J. Service of his approaching retirement from public  
e owing to age and ill-health. He claimed that the Coalition  
nistry then existing had been of immense benefit to the colony,  
securing the complete abolition of the political management  
railways and of political patronage. But the success which  
s crowned his long and persistent efforts to bring about the  
ablishment of the Federal Council may be regarded as the  
owning act of his political career. Mr. Graham Berry seized  
s opportunity to claim for himself the post of Agent-General  
the colony in London. His plea, too, was ill-health and the  
ed of prolonged rest ; but whether his state of health was such  
to justify his breaking up a strong Coalition Ministry by his  
ignation was an open question. His constituents begged him  
reconsider the matter, and urged that Protection was in  
ager ; but he declined to change his plans, saying that the  
pointment was only for three years, and that after that  
erval he hoped to return to the colony and re-enter public life.  
e recommended that Mr. Deakin should be his successor as  
der of the Liberal party, but his advice on this point was  
t followed, and Mr. Gillies became the new Premier of "

Coalition Ministry. The arrangement was a short-lived one, for in a few weeks the Coalition broke up, and Mr. Gillies was charged with the formation of a homogeneous Ministry; but to carry this out a dissolution of Parliament was necessary. The elections took place the first week in March, and resulted in a substantial victory for the Government, the return being 54 Ministerialists, 18 Opposition members, and 14 Independents, all the ministers except one being re-elected. The new Parliament was formally opened (March 1) by commission, but at once adjourned. On reassembling for the despatch of business (June 1) the Governor (Sir H. Loch) congratulated the colony on the sound condition of its finances and its general prosperity. He alluded to the unanimity with which the people of Victoria had supported the Government in protesting against a French occupation of the New Hebrides, and hoped the Imperial Government would uphold the understanding of 1878, which maintained the independence of those islands. He also referred to the satisfactory progress of the colonial defences, and announced that Admiral Tryon's proposals for strengthening the Australian squadron had been under the consideration of the Government.

The Government introduced an important Irrigation Bill, by which it was proposed to borrow 4,000,000*l.* for constructing works adequate to the supply of water to at least 3,242,000 acres of land in several of the more arid districts, principally in the northern portion of the colony. The proceeds of the loan were to be lent to different local trusts, which were to construct the works and have the power of levying rates to meet the interest which would become payable to the Government on account of the advances. These works, although immediately in the interest of the farmers and squatters, were really of a national character, and, if successful, would conduce incalculably to the productive powers of the land. It was estimated that the rates would amount to about 1*l.* an acre on the properties supplied, a moderate charge for so great a benefit.

In making his Budget statement (July 21) Mr. Gillies explained that the revenue for the year to June 30 had amounted to 6,416,000*l.*, or 130,000*l.* above the estimate, and the expenditure to 6,615,000*l.*, the actual surplus being 329,000*l.* He estimated the revenue for the ensuing year, including the balance for 1886, at 6,970,000*l.*, and the expenditure at 6,915,000*l.*, and anticipated a surplus of 58,000*l.* Of the total debt of 30,000,000*l.*, the actual outlay on railways had been 24,856,000*l.*, including 1,000,000*l.* on lines still under construction. The net railway revenue for the year had been 1,000,000*l.*, which left a profit of 33,000*l.*, after payment of the working expenses and interest on loans; the gross railway revenue for the ensuing year was estimated at 2,425,000*l.*, which would leave a profit of 66,000*l.* Mr. Gillies proposed to make exemptions in and also to reduce

the duties affecting farmers, and to increase the duties on woollen piece-goods and wearing apparel by 5 per cent., with a view to assisting and equalising the industries concerned. The Post Office showed a loss of 109,000*l.*, due largely to the introduction of the sixpenny rate for telegrams, and to the increased facilities granted to the public. The Savings Bank deposits had largely augmented, indicating the growth of thrift and prosperity in the community. Mr. Gillies also announced that material progress had been made with the defences of Port Phillip, for which a further sum of 188,000*l.* for the construction of a fort at Port Phillip Head was afterwards asked and voted. The financial statement was favourably received, and the fact of a substantial balance, coupled with the termination of the longest drought known for a generation, caused the outlook of the colony to be most hopeful. The Budget, however, was not allowed to pass unscathed through the House of Assembly. A debate began, which lasted over many weeks, and consisted of nothing but ridiculous and undignified wrangles as to whether the import duty on woollen goods should be 20 per cent., as proposed by the Government, or 25 per cent., as contended by the Parliamentary delegates of the mill-owners and their operatives. The Government stuck to and carried their original proposal, contending that manufacturers who could not work at a profit with a protective duty of 20 per cent., plus freight, commissions, and other charges, should not exist at all, or should only exist at the expense of the clothes-wearing community at large. Simultaneously with his waste of time in the Assembly over the woollen duties were the constantly recurring cries of the unemployed, and the dictatorial demands of the trades-unions upon almost every class of employers. For some days the Minister of Works was almost mobbed in his office by the so-called unemployed, who demanded that the Government should not only find them employment at the current wages of 7*s.* a day for unskilled labour, but stipulated that it should be "day work." When the Minister suggested that several Government contractors were ready to employ additional men, the rejoinder was that breaking stones blistered their hands, that they must have work they were accustomed to, that it must not be contract work, and that it must be in Melbourne. On the day on which the Budget finally passed (Aug. 18) a debate arose on the New Hebrides question, attention being called to their continued occupation by French troops, and further action in the matter was urged by several members. The leader of the Opposition said he desired to strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with the question. The Premier replied that the only satisfactory solution would be the fixing a date for the departure of the French troops, and he was confident the new Home Government would give the matter every attention as soon as it was settled down in office.

*Parliament was prorogued by the Governor (Dec. 18), who*

stated that the country was in a condition of great prosperity, and the revenue steadily increasing. He was pleased to find that the colony was being rapidly placed in a position of complete defence, and congratulated Parliament on its prompt adoption of the proposal to hold an exhibition in connection with the centenary celebration in New South Wales in 1888. With regard to the Water Supply and Irrigation Act of the past session, he considered it was one of vital concern to the colony, for it empowered the Government to unlock and distribute unemployed water, and provided for the settlement of vexed questions arising from the indeterminate nature of riparian rights.

In the course of the year the colony lost a valuable and zealous helper in the person of Dr. Moorhouse, who was appointed to the Bishopric of Manchester. He had been Bishop of Melbourne for nine years, and had occupied a foremost place in the religious and intellectual life of the colony. The Anglican Cathedral had been erected almost entirely through his exertions, and in the previous year he had been elected Chancellor of the Melbourne University. By means of public speeches and writings he had also rendered valuable aid in furthering Imperial Federation, irrigation, and other public questions. The material prosperity of the colony was increased by an abundant harvest, the grain was gathered in excellent condition, and the yield was estimated at upwards of 12,000,000 bushels, averaging 12 bushels to an acre. The excess available for export was expected to be about 140,000 tons, being 60,000 tons more than in 1885. The amount of gold found in the colony during the year was less by 130,000 ounces than in 1885, but early in December the old Magdala Company, at Stawell, had a splendid find, having struck a reef twenty-four feet thick, of which the specimens broken out were estimated to contain fifty ounces of ore to the ton of quartz.

*Queensland* (including *New Guinea*).—The beginning of the year found the northern part of the colony still clamouring for separation. The movement, which has of late increased in force, is based on the idea that in the apportionment of the revenue and loans, by reason of the inadequacy of representation and the remoteness of the seat of Government, the claims of the northern province were neglected; and a petition, signed by 10,000 persons out of an electoral roll of 11,800, was sent to the British Government in June, indicating that the great bulk of the people, and not a mere section, were in favour of separation. The northern planters complained that the Government would neither adequately supply them with coloured labour nor grant facilities for obtaining it at their own cost, suggesting the cultivation of sugar with white labour, an expensive and doubtful expedient. A counter-movement was, however, set on foot against separation, but when the leader of the Separatist Party (Mr. Macrossan) introduced his Bill (Sept. 2) for dividing North and South Queensland, it was rejected by 40 to 9, the Government maintaining that a remedy



the grievances of the northerners could be found without resorting to such extremities.

The Queen has power (24 and 25 Vic. c. 44) to create a new colony upon the petition of the inhabitants of any of the territories lying north of 30° south latitude (the southern limit of Queensland), and as a matter of fact the boundary line was lifted in 1861. North Queensland now numbers about 60,000 Europeans, of whom about 3,500 are interested in the sugar industry and employ black labour, the great majority of the population being engaged in agriculture and stock-keeping, or in the development of the mineral products of the country. All the same, whilst unanimous in their desire for separation, are strongly opposed to the introduction of coolies or other coloured races as their fellow-colonists in the south.

The question which arose in Nov. 1885, as to the payment of members of the Assembly for attending in Parliament, resulted in a deadlock between the two Houses. The right of the Council to amend a Money Bill was in due course referred to the Privy Council for their opinion. The two points submitted for consideration were—(1) whether the Constitution Act of 1867 conferred on the Legislative Council powers to co-ordinate with those of the Legislative Assembly in the amendment of all Bills, including Money Bills; and (2) whether the claims of the Legislative Assembly, as set forth in their message of Nov. 12, were well founded. The Judicial Committee agreed to report that the answer to both of these points should be answered in the negative, and the Council decided in the affirmative. The whole question was thus decided in favour of the Legislative Assembly, and this decision was confirmed by an Order in Council issued on April 3.

The state of politics in Europe impressed the Government with the necessity for agreeing upon some system for the protection of the colony. The Defence Act of 1885 was found fully adequate for this purpose, and was forthwith brought into operation, the popularity of the measure being proved by its results in the past year. The Easter Encampment, with 1,600 men of all ranks under canvas for eight days, was a distinct success, and proved that the citizen soldiers were not only well trained and disciplined but showed real endurance. Nor was the colony mindful of its naval defences. A conference on the subject between the Governors and Premiers of the Australian colonies was at one time arranged, but owing to political causes it was never carried out. Admiral Tryon, however, was ordered by the British Government to visit the different Australian Governments to obtain their views on naval defence. A conference, held on April 26) on board H.M. ship *Nelson* in Port Jackson, resulted in a joint Report, and a despatch embodying its recommendation was sent to the Colonial Secretary. The basis of the proposition was that the war vessels necessary for the defence of Australia should be provided and equipped by the Imperial Government,

but that the colonies should pay to the latter annually a sum representing the ordinary depreciation, in addition to the annual cost of maintenance of the guard-ships.

The Queensland Parliament was opened (July 13) by Sir A. Palmer, Acting-Governor in the absence of Sir Anthony Musgrave, who stated that the Crown Lands Act of 1864 was working well, that the finances of the country were sound, notwithstanding the effects of the drought, and that its credit was proved by the success of the recent loan. He also announced that Bills would be introduced dealing with local government and administrative arrangements in the more distant parts of the colony. The Customs revenue for the financial year amounted to 1,004,754*l.*, being an increase of 67,528*l.* on the previous year.

In August the Colonial Treasurer (Mr. Dickson) made his financial statement, estimating the revenue for 1886-87 at 3,000,000*l.*, and the expenditure at 3,069,000*l.*, showing a slight deficit, which he attributed to the cessation of the land sales under the new Land Act, and to the effects of a four years' drought of unprecedented severity. A material rise in the price of wool, a sugar crop exceeding 50,000 tons, and favourable reports of the mining, pastoral, and agricultural industries, combined to make the prospect most hopeful. The Treasurer proposed to meet the immediate requirements by an increase of the *ad valorem* duties from 5 to 7½ per cent., the imposition of succession duties on real estate on the basis of the Victoria statute, and the discontinuance of the endowment of local bodies under the Health Act. It was thought the saving effected by these changes would be sufficient to provide for what was regarded as only a temporary difficulty. Parliament, on being prorogued (Dec. 4) by Sir A. Palmer, was informed that the Government intended during the recess to prepare measures for the administration of public business in distant parts of the colony, in order to remove the evils arising from undue centralisation. It was also proposed to establish branches of the public departments for the outlay of the revenue raised in the respective districts.

The mining statistics of the colony for 1885 showed that the yield of gold from the quartz was 289,500 ounces, and from the alluvial mines 22,000 ounces; 14,000 tons of tin were also raised, as well as 7,100 tons of silver and lead, and 209,500 tons of coal. The Etheridge goldfield appears to be one of the most extensive tracts of auriferous soil yet opened up, its length being about 170 miles, its greatest width 80, and its area 9,760 square miles, whilst the great Gilbert River runs through its whole length. The average yield of gold from the quartz on this goldfield has been about 2 oz. 10 dwt. per ton.

In New Guinea matters have made but little progress since the death of Sir Peter Scratchley and the temporary appoint-

ment of Mr. Douglas as High Commissioner. Complaint was made that little or nothing was being done in return for the 15,000*l.* per annum contributed by the colonies towards the expenses of the Protectorate, whilst in German New Guinea strenuous efforts were being made to open up the country and encourage trade. New complications had also arisen from the South Australian Government declining to contribute any further to the cost of the New Guinea Government, and it was expected that New Zealand, Tasmania, and Western Australia would follow suit. Under these circumstances, Mr. Griffith, Premier of Queensland, drafted a scheme for the future administration of New Guinea, and his proposals, after being approved by the various Premiers, were sent to England for Her Majesty's assent. The Queensland Assembly, moreover, acting separately from the other colonial legislatures, passed, in November, a resolution to the effect that, subject to the approval of Her Majesty, that colony was willing at once to defray the whole expenses of the administration of New Guinea. The British Government telegraphed in reply that the establishment of sovereignty in New Guinea would probably involve an expenditure of 150,000*l.* with a prospect of little revenue, whilst it was unnecessary for the defence of Australia from foreign attack. It was, however, ready to give a small initial contribution, as proposed in 1885, if the colonies would undertake to secure a sufficient annual sum by a permanent Act. The Colonial Office officials also thought favourably of many of Mr., now Sir, S. Griffith's proposals for the administration of New Guinea, but declined to discuss them until the financial question was settled. These were briefly that the Queensland Government should administer New Guinea, guaranteeing for that purpose 15,000*l.* annually on the understanding that the other colonies would contribute proportionally to the expenses of government. The sovereignty of the Queen would thus be established over the British portion of the island, and an administration appointed with powers to preserve order. Native interests were to be protected, the deportation of natives and the trade in liquor, arms, and ammunition being placed under the control of the Queensland Government. The purchase of land, except from the Government, would be prohibited, and other matters would be under the direction of the Governor of Queensland and the Executive Council of that colony. The decision of the Imperial Government was received with disappointment throughout the colony, and before the year closed the Governor again telegraphed to the Secretary of State with regard to the amount of guarantee, 15,000*l.* According to the views of his responsible advisers that sum would be ample for a few years to open up the country and maintain order. No future charges upon England were proposed, but everything, excepting the initial share of the Imperial Government, was to be borne by the colonies or by New Guinea. The colonial Parliaments, however,

were unwilling to give a perpetual guarantee for any fixed period for an administration which might be temporary, and must be experimental. The Governor also pointed out that under the existing condition of affairs there was no provision for punishing offences, a fact which might lead to reprisals, and involve the Government in serious complications.

*South Australia* (including *North Australia*).—In this colony a vigorous policy of retrenchment has been pursued throughout the year. The Assembly carried a motion by 20 to 1 to reduce the amount set aside for naval and military defence from 51,831*l.* to 37,831*l.*, and in the Civil Service many economies were effected, at the expense of individual office-holders. The Treasurer (Mr. Bray), in making his financial statement (June 30), stated that the revenue for 1885-86 had been 2,250,000*l.* and the expenditure 2,071,000*l.*, whilst for 1886-87 the estimated revenue was only 2,100,000*l.*, and the expenditure 2,200,000*l.*. The Customs revenue had fallen off by 140,000*l.*, and the railway receipts by 80,000*l.* The accumulated deficit amounted to less than 850,000*l.*, and the total debt of the colony 18,353,300*l.*, or nearly 58*l.* 10*s.* per head of the population. To meet the expenses of the case new taxation was proposed, which, it was expected, would yield 109,000*l.*, and to this proposal the Assembly, after some discussion, agreed. On the other hand the Assembly rejected the Government scheme for the amendment of the Land Act, with a view to meet the interest on Treasury Bills, with which it was proposed to cover the deficit. In pursuance, moreover, of its plan of retrenchment, the Government decided not to contribute funds towards the proposed Imperial Institute, holding that such expenditure might stand in the way of the interests of the Jubilee Exhibition, to be held at Adelaide in 1887. Gold was found during the year in considerable quantity in the Teetulpa and Wankaringa districts, attracting a gathering of 5,000 persons to the former diggings.

*North Australia*, a huge district of 523,620 square miles, formally annexed in 1863 to South Australia, has until now remained undeveloped. It is still without Parliamentary representation, the administration being in the hands of a Resident and a staff of officials appointed from Adelaide; a condition of things which will come to an end as soon as the district musters 1,000 electors. Palmerston, the capital, better known by its harbour, Port Darwin, at present contains about 1,000 Europeans, 700 Chinese inhabitants, together with a few natives. The great drawback to residence is the difficulty of communication, except by telegraph, with other places, it being 3,740 miles by sea to Adelaide, or about twenty-one days' steaming, so that the two extremities of the colony known as South Australia are practically about two months apart, Port Darwin being nearer Europe and India than any other place in Australia. The completion of the railway between it and Adelaide is a matter of vital importance.

nce. Already 600 miles are constructed, but twice as many more must be completed before the voyage from Europe to the southern Australian colonies can be further shortened. Meanwhile the resources of North Australia are being gradually developed. The pastoral land already leased, amounting to 38,287 square miles, yields to the Government an annual revenue of 21,679*l.*, but agriculture has not advanced much, in spite of liberal encouragement by the Government.

*Western Australia.*—The principal event of the year has been the discovery of gold in the Kimberley district of this colony, and an Act was forthwith passed for the management of the gold-field, similar to that adopted by the Queensland Legislature. The gold appeared to be plentiful and of good quality, but the district was difficult of access, approachable only by a tropical land journey of over 300 miles.

*Tasmania.*—The formal assembling of the first Federal Council of the Australasian colonies took place at Hobart (Jan. 5), all the members being present. Mr. James Service, ex-premier of Victoria, was elected President. The Governor, in bidding the delegates welcome, expressed his regret that the colonies of New South Wales, South Australia, and New Zealand were not represented, but the remainder at once proceeded to the despatch of business. The Council, after due deliberation, passed several measures, including Bills authorising the service of civil process outside the jurisdiction of the colony issuing it, and providing for the enforcement of judgments of the Supreme Court within the Federation. The Council also voted an address to the Governor, praying for the communication of despatches and papers concerning the administration of New Guinea, and passed an address to the Queen, referring to the Franco-German Convention in regard to the South Sea Islands, and strongly urging the continuance of the agreement between the British and French governments, by which the independence of the New Hebrides had been guaranteed. A Standing Committee, with Mr. S. Griffith, Q.C., Premier of Queensland, as chairman, was appointed to transact during the recess the business of the Council, which was then prorogued (Feb. 6). In Tasmania the close of the year 1885 had found the two Houses of Parliament at a deadlock in consequence of a dispute over the Bill for raising 1,000,000*l.* in adventure stock in London. The Council amended the Bill by reducing the amount by 40,000*l.*, stating that the items being of a ephemeral character should be charged on the consolidated revenue of the year. The Government declined to accept the amendment, and the Assembly indorsed their decision almost unanimously. The Chief Secretary thereupon moved in the Council that the amendment should not be insisted upon, but the motion was rejected. But the Council expressed its willingness to consent to the issue of Treasury bills to the amount of 1,000*l.*; and this promise was ultimately agreed to after a long



debate. At a subsequent date, when Parliament was opened by the Governor (Sir G. Strachan), he was able to announce that the revenue of the colony was the largest on record, and that there would be no increase of taxation.

*New Zealand.*—The spring of the year found this colony prosperous and contented; the financial condition was hopeful, showing a surplus of 37,000*l.* for the previous year, whilst native affairs were never more satisfactory. Titles to millions of acres were passing through the Land Courts, for the natives were willing to sell their holdings along the course of the Trunk line. The Treasurer (Sir J. Vogel), in making his financial statement (May 25), estimated the revenue for the current year 4,110,000*l.*, including the previous year's surplus, and the expenditure at 4,070,000*l.*, thus showing a surplus of 42,000*l.* admitting the reduction of the property tax by  $\frac{1}{16}d.$  The operations for the conversion of the debt in London had yielded during three years a saving of 454,000*l.* Sir J. Vogel further proposed to issue a new loan of 1,500,000*l.*, to be devoted exclusively to railway construction, and concluded by declaring the colony to be in a sound and satisfactory condition. This loan having been authorised, was issued in London during October, tenders being invited for 1,567,800*l.* at 4 per cent., repayable at par on Nov. 1, 1929. The applications amounted to 2,094,000*l.*, at prices varying from 100*l.* to 97*l.*, the minimum, the average price obtained being 97*l.* 5*s.* The population of the colony on June 30, 1885, was 572,132, exclusive of 45,000 Maoris. The imports in 1885 were 7,500,000*l.* sterling, and the exports 7,000,000*l.*, of which more than six-sevenths went to the mother country. On the other hand, the public debt amounted to 34,000,000*l.* sterling, equal to about 60*l.* per head of the white population. But although money had been borrowed with a lavish hand, it had for the most part been spent on railways, roads, and other public works. With regard to the products, it may be mentioned that of coal the mines have turned out altogether upwards of 3,000,000 tons, of which 43,893 tons were exported in 1885; of gold, between 1857 and the end of 1885, 10,789,650 ounces, valued at 42,327,907*l.*; and of timber, the quantity exported in 1885 was valued at about 160,000*l.* The colony is rich in timber of all kinds, especially cabinet woods, of which there are thirty or forty kinds, and the Government has become quite alive to the value of its colonial timber, and will not allow the 12,000,000 acres under wood to be cleared without discrimination and foresight.

On June 9, at midnight, there was a terrible volcanic outbreak at Rotorua, one of the loveliest spots on earth, which swept away the renowned picturesque surroundings of the famous hot springs. One hundred natives and ten Englishmen perished, and villages were buried under ten feet of ashes and débris, while cattle died of hunger for want of grass.

On Aug. 1 the Kermadec Islands, which lie between New land and the Friendly Islands, were annexed to Great ain by H.M.S. *Diamond*, but the announcement was not ally announced during the year.

A serious disturbance occurred near Hawera in July, when Maori men and women made an incursion into some lands nging to the Europeans, and began ploughing and erecting hare. The civil police arrested several chiefs, including Kowaru. After a slight resistance the other Maoris were ersed, and the Government then ordered the arrest of the ori chief Te Whiti, as the instigator of the outrage. The oris explained that their action was merely a formal assertion he ownership of some forfeited land. The chiefs all pleaded ty. Te Whiti was sentenced to three months' imprisonment a fine of 100*l.*, and Tito Kowaru and the others to one month a fine of 20*l.* Although further troubles were expected at time of the outbreak, there was no excitement in the district, quiet continued to prevail.

*North Borneo.*—In this island the prospects of the North neo Company have been very satisfactory during the year, for le and revenue were both increasing to a considerable extent. d has been discovered in various districts, and a company is ady formed for extracting the precious metal, whilst others in process of formation for developing the different resources he colony. The country produces much valuable timber and er tropical trees; tobacco has been systematically planted, l pearls and mother-o'-pearl shells are found in abundance the coast. Complaints reached England early in the year t cessions of land had been obtained from a native prince ough a minister not duly authorised, and that the natives had ered in consequence, but the results of the inquiry promised the Government have not been published.

*Samoa.*—This island appears to have been in a perturbed te during the year. King Malietoa addressed (May 13) a munication to the United States Consul, stating that a por- of his subjects, led by King Tomacsesi, had revolted, and uesting the Consul to issue a proclamation ordering all noans to return to their homes. The Consul, accord- ly, on the following day ordered the people to disperse; a joint proclamation, signed by the British, United States, German Consuls, was issued (May 27) recognising King lietoa's authority. There had also been a good deal of ex- ment earlier in the year through the action of the German isul in tearing down the King's flag within the city of Apia, l in spite of the protests of the British and United States isuls. Nothing came of this high-handed proceeding, but it e rise to rumours in Europe that Samoa had been annexed Germany, though such a step would have been a direct ch of the agreement between Great Britain, Germany, and

the United States, under which the Samoan Islands could not be annexed by either of those countries without the concurrence of the others. These islands have attracted so much attention that a few words as to their present status may be interesting. There are really two groups of islands. The more westerly contains Sawaii, Upolu, and Tatiula, has a large population, and is in every way the most important. Malietoa is a king who reigns but does not govern, and who not long ago remarked that he and his Parliament made plenty of excellent laws, but that no one took the smallest notice of them. There is also a vice-king, Tapua, a House of Lords, and a House of Representatives, the two Houses sitting as one Assembly. In reality there is no Government at all, the Samoans obeying their tribal chiefs, whilst these obey no one unless compelled. The King, with the concurrence of the majority of his people, has more than once begged that Samoa might be annexed to Great Britain, but this request has not been granted. Apia, the capital, by a Convention in 1879 between Great Britain, Germany, the United States, and Samoa, was constituted a Municipality under the government of the Consuls and an elected Board, the property assessed for rating being valued at 46,000*l*. It is an orderly and well-conducted place, enjoying a local government, with laws, a magistrate, police, revenue, expenditure, sanitary regulations, port authorities, and all the usual institutions of a civilised commercial state. The native population numbers about 34,000, all of whom have been converted to Christianity; 250 white men, of whom 80 are British and 100 German subjects, and upwards of 400 half-castes. The harbour of Pango Pango, in Tatiula, is perhaps the finest in the Pacific Ocean. The Germans claim the ownership of 202,000 acres, under the title of "The South Sea Trading and Plantation Company," and the British 357,000 acres, much of which, however, is in the comparatively barren island of Sawaii. The productive cocoa-nut plantations are almost entirely in the hands of Germans, and in the history of this industry will be found the secret of the inconvenient prominence which Samoa has attained in the relations between Great Britain and Germany. The fertility of the soil is not excelled by that of any other tropical country, and the climate is admirably adapted to Europeans. The natives are the lightest in complexion of all the Polynesian races, and their intelligence and physical beauty entitle them to a high place among the various divisions of the human family.

# PART II.

## CHRONICLE OF EVENTS

### IN 1886.

#### JANUARY.

1. The annexation of Upper Burmah to the territories of the Queen Empress notified to the inhabitants of Rangoon, &c., in the name of the Viceroy.

— Mr. T. D. Sullivan, M.P., installed as Lord Mayor of Dublin, and for the first time in the history of the Corporation city artisans' and labourers' societies, &c., with upwards of thirty bands, took the part usually occupied by the military.

— A great fire broke out at Detroit, Michigan, in which a large theatre, numerous warehouses, and other buildings were destroyed, of the value of \$1,000,000.

2. George Herbert Thackeray, arrested at Grimsby on a charge of vagrancy, made a voluntary confession of having aided in the murder of a city clerk, John Tower, at Stoke Newington, on New Year's Eve, 1884. Mr. Tower's body had been found in a reservoir of the New River Company, Queen Elizabeth's Walk, and although at the inquest the jury returned a verdict of wilful murder, the police had always inclined to the view of suicide.

— It was reported that fox-hunting had been altogether abandoned in Tipperary, in consequence of the continued poisoning of foxes and hounds. In Limerick County the members of the hunt decided, after a long discussion, to discontinue hunting.

3. The silver jubilee (or twenty-fifth anniversary) of the accession of the Emperor William to the throne of Prussia celebrated with great enthusiasm in Berlin and elsewhere.

4. Troops despatched from Manchester to Llandulas to protect a body of English workmen who had been hired to take the place of the men on strike. The Englishmen were, in spite of some opposition, installed in their quarters.

— Severe earthquake shock felt in South Devonshire, between Dartmouth and Kingsbridge.

4. Whilst driving out in the neighbourhood of Bayonne General Bourbaki's horses took fright, and at length fell over a steep embankment, dragging the carriage and its occupants with them.

6. A heavy fall of snow, extending over the greater part of Scotland and England, rendered traffic, especially in London and the large towns, difficult. The telegraph wires were largely destroyed, and much damage was done to the timber trees throughout the country by the weight of snow. In Scotland and the North of England the snowstorm was accompanied by a severe gale, which, on the coasts, occasioned great loss of life and shipping.

— A great strike of caulkers, riveters, platers, &c., employed in the ship-building trades on the Tyne and Wear commenced. The reason given was the proposed reduction of wages notified by the masters.

7. First annual conference of the National Society of Professional Musicians held at the Salisbury Hotel, London, under the presidency of Mr. Ebenezer Prout.

— Two trains on the Great Eastern Railway came into collision at the Manor Park Station,  $6\frac{1}{4}$  miles from London. The carriages of the trains were telescoped, and some took fire. Eight persons were very seriously injured. The accident was attributed to the bursting of a steam-pipe of one engine which became unmanageable.

8. Astley Castle, Warwickshire, the seat of Mr. C. N. Newdegate, narrowly escaped destruction, the woodwork in some old chimneys having taken fire.

— The Earl of Iddesleigh appointed Lord-Lieutenant of the county of Devon.

— A spinning-mill at Aix-la-Chapelle caught fire and burnt to the ground, causing the death of fifteen persons. On the same night a fire broke out in Philadelphia, destroying a number of cotton, woollen, and gingham mills, together with property, &c., to the value of a million dollars.

9. Traffic on the London and North-Western main line interrupted by a landslip in the cutting outside Christleton Tunnel, between Chester and Crewe. A portion of the embankment of the Shropshire Union Canal was carried away at the same time, and the water overflowed the railway.

— Nearly one hundred persons immersed in Regent's Park water, owing to the sudden giving way of the ice. The accident, which took place almost on the same spot as the fatal disaster of 1867, was unattended with any loss of life.

10. At Cartagena, late at night, two corporals and forty civilians, traitorously admitted by a sergeant, surprised the commander of Fort St. Julian whilst asleep. The military governor, General Fajardo, at once hastened to the fort with a few civil guards. They were received by a discharge of musketry, three shots striking the General. The mutineers then hurriedly decamped, reached some rowing boats, and made for a merchant vessel lying in the port, which at once weighed anchor.

11. The Jersey Banking Company stopped payment, with liabilities amounting to about 400,000*l.*—a disaster followed by the stoppage of another local bank (Messrs. De Gouchy's) shortly afterwards.



11. A terrific storm, following upon very cold weather, raged along the American seaboard from Cape Hatteras to Labrador, destroying an immense amount of shipping, houses, and property, and many lives.

12. The first session of the eleventh Parliament of the reign met to hear the Royal Commission, and Mr. Arthur W. Peel re-elected Speaker of the House of Commons without opposition.

— Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts of England and Wales, Sir R. A. Cross being chairman, and among the members Cardinal Manning, the Bishop of London, Dr. Rigg, Mr. Geo. Shipton, &c.

13. A gale of extraordinary violence, accompanied by thunder and lightning, passed across England, travelling from the Yorkshire coast through the Midlands, where its effects were most disastrous, towards Devonshire.

— The body of M. Barrême, préfet of the Eure, found lying on the railway near Maisons Laffitte, having been apparently thrown from the train in which he was travelling from Paris to Cherbourg. He had been shot through the temple, and it was supposed that the intention of the murderer was to throw the body into the Seine, at the spot where the river is crossed by the railway.

14. A formidable Socialist plot, directed against capitalists, said to have been discovered in Chicago.

— Dr. Moorhouse, Bishop of Melbourne, appointed Bishop of Manchester, to the room of the late Dr. Fraser.

15. A subsidence of at least two feet, extending for a distance of nearly forty yards, discovered on the main line of the North British Railway, between Prestonpans and Inveresk. The London express had a narrow escape of being thrown off the lines, but managed to keep the track, which runs over the remains of old colliery workings.

— John Mayer, photographer, sentenced to seven years' penal servitude for sending threatening letters to the Prince of Wales, with the object of extorting money by revealing an imaginary plot against his life.

— At a colliery at Almy, Wyoming, an explosion occurred just as a train was entering the shaft. The trucks and men (thirteen in number) were blown out in pieces, as if from a cannon, and the surrounding country within a radius of 700 yards was desolated.

16. Mr. Joseph Arch, M.P., entertained at dinner at the National Liberal Club, attended by a large number of members of Parliament. The president, Right Hon. J. Chamberlain, proposed the toast of the evening, "The newly enfranchised agricultural labourers and their first direct representative in Parliament."

— The "States" of the island of Jersey declared their treasurer bankrupt, and temporarily suspended all legislative business.

18. Rev. John Gott, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, appointed Dean of Worcester.

— Mr. W. Stead, the term of whose sentence had expired, released from Holloway Gaol; and received in the evening at an enthusiastic meeting in Exeter Hall, attended by the clergy and laity of all denominations.

18. The Mansfield magistrates committed for manslaughter a woman, named Elizabeth Harris, charged with having slowly roasted her infant child to death before a large fire.

19. Several important deputations, representing Irish trade and commerce, from Belfast, Cork, Dublin, &c., waited upon Lord Salisbury to protest against any measure which would separate Ireland from the rest of the United Kingdom.

— Wm. Sheehan executed at Cork for the murder of his mother, brother, and sister, seven years previously. He had given himself up to the police, and, after trial, was found guilty.

20. The Mersey Tunnel, connecting Birkenhead and Liverpool, formally opened by the Prince of Wales. The tunnel, a brick-lined tube bored through the solid rock, was sunk many feet below the bed of the river, and was 1,260 yards in length, 26 feet in width, and 19 feet in height above the rails. The project of making a tunnel was originally sanctioned in 1870; but it was not taken up with any vigour until 1879, since which time about 8,000 workmen were employed in the works.

— Repeated earthquake shocks felt in Cornwall, at the neighbourhood of Bodmin, St. Blazey, and St. Austell, and considerable alarm created in some of the mines, under the impression that the water had broken in.

21. The Queen opened Parliament in state. In spite of the severe wintry weather the crowd was enormous, and her Majesty was cordially welcomed.

— The Bank rate reduced to 3 per cent. from 4 per cent., at which it had stood since Dec 17. The reserve, in which the gold stood for nearly 21 millions, represented 89½ per cent. of the liabilities.

— A terrible fire broke out in some cabinetmakers' workshops in the Belleville quarter of Paris, and spread rapidly. Two men were burnt to death, and five so severely injured that their lives were in the greatest danger, whilst many of the inmates of the upper stories of the building were much hurt in making their escape.

22. In consequence of apprehensions aroused by certain Irish suspects, the train conveying the Prince of Wales and his sons to Chester, on a visit to the Duke of Westminster, stopped at a wayside station a few miles short of its destination, whence the royal party drove to Eaton Hall, which was surrounded by a cordon of police.

— Viscount Cranbrook appointed Secretary of State for War, in succession to Right Hon. W. H. Smith, transferred to the Secretaryship for Ireland.

23. The poorhouse at Jackson, Michigan, burned down during the night; the mercury meanwhile standing at 10° below zero, so that no water was obtainable. Forty of the inmates, five of them insane, blind, or deaf, were literally roasted to death. The others rushed out half naked into the snow, and suffered greatly from the exposure.

25. The formal opening of the Australasian Federal Council took place, Hobart (Tasmania) having been selected as the first meeting-place. Mr. Service (Victoria) was elected president.

25. The Government defeated by 829 to 250 on amendment to the Address proposed by Mr. Jesse Collings.

— The British fleet, under the command of Admiral Lord John Hay, ordered to the Piræus.

26. A terrible explosion of gas, involving the destruction of a large part of Victoria Station, Norwich, took place in the goods office, but although very great damage was done to the building no persons were injured.

27. The polling at Croydon resulted in the return of Hon. Sidney Herbert (Conservative) by 5,205, against 4,458 votes given to Mr. S. Buxton (Liberal).

— Mr. Seymour Lucas elected an Associate of the Royal Academy.

29. Right Hon. H. C. Childers (Liberal) elected member for the Southern division of Edinburgh by 4,029 votes, against 1,780 given to the Master of Dalwarth (Conservative).

— A leaden coffin, enclosing a wooden one, discovered in a mass of masonry under the grand arch of the Lady Chapel of Winchester. The skeleton (well preserved) which was found inside the coffin was identified that of Bishop Peter Courtenay, who died in 1492.

30. The isolated front (about 80 feet) of four old houses in the Holloway had thrown down by a gust of wind, and five persons who were passing at the time were killed. For some months the walls had been used by billsters, and were all that remained of a number of old dilapidated tenements which were in course of removal.

## FEBRUARY.

1. A mutiny broke out on board the reformatory ship *Clarence*, lying in the Mersey. The boys for some time held possession of the ship, but the police, arriving from Liverpool in a tug, took fourteen of the ringleaders and restored order.

— Mr. Wyatt, a checker at the Army and Navy Stores, recovered 500*l.* damages from the Rosherville Gardens Company for the bite of a bear. He had been feeding the animal, and then turned away to speak to a friend, when the bear seized his arm, pulled it through the bars, and fixed his teeth in it. Baron Huddleston agreed with the verdict, holding that the company had not exercised sufficient care.

— Sir J. Porter Corry (Conservative) elected member for Mid-Armagh by 74 votes, his opponent, Mr. J. A. Dickson (Liberal), polling 2,965.

2. A fire took place at Duffryn Hall, the Welsh seat of Lord Aberdare, in consequence of a good supply of water was prevented extending.

— An attempt to murder M. G. de Montauzan made in the Hôtel du Havre by the "Comte de Tredernes," who subsequently admitted that his real name was Baron Louis Artaud-Hausmann. He had broken the pneumatic clock from the mantelpiece, and with it nearly stunned M. de Montauzan. Two loaded revolvers and a dagger were found upon M. Artaud-Hausmann, who finally submitted to arrest.

3. The Lord Mayor received at the Mansion House a deputation of twelve delegates, representing various trade organisations, by whom he was urged to establish a fund for the relief of the unemployed, of which the number were very few in excess of the average. The Lord Mayor consented to open a fund as soon as the facts of the case were put before him in a practical form.

— A revolt took place among the younger convicts at Belleisle-en-Mer. They overpowered their guards, and it was not until the military arrived at the prison, and after a protracted struggle, in which many convicts were seriously wounded, that order was restored.

— Mr. Gladstone laid before the Queen a list of the members constituting his new Cabinet.

4. Excessively severe weather reported from the United States. The snow, starting from the Rocky Mountains, crossed the whole continent, in some places lying in huge stretches many feet deep. The Southern States, where snow is scarcely known, did not escape. The railroads were blocked, horse traffic suspended, and many lives lost from exposure.

— At the weekly meeting of the School Board for London Sir Richard Temple brought up and explained the budget for the ensuing year. In consequence of the expenditure to which the Board had been committed by its predecessor, and of the outstanding liabilities, the school-rate for the Metropolis would have to be raised from 8½d. to 9½d. in the pound, the total expenditure for the year 1886–87 being estimated at over a million and a half.

5. Lord Salisbury, in reply to a deputation of the unemployed, which waited upon him at his private residence, expressed the opinion that the starting of great public works around London ought to receive the favourable consideration of the Government.

— Peerages conferred upon Sir Charles Mills, Sir Henry Allsopp, and Sir Edmund Beckett.

— The palace of Prince Anton Radziwill, aide-de-camp to the German Emperor, in close proximity to the Brandenburg Thor guardhouse, entered by burglars, who carried off a large quantity of silver, including large plates and dishes, some of which they had to throw away, on account of their weight. Only four days previously the house of Count Albedyll, another imperial aide-de-camp, was similarly plundered.

6. The *Edinburgh Courant*, the oldest newspaper in Scotland, to which Scott, Wilson, Lockhart, Aytoun, De Quincey, Hannay, and Hogg had been contributors, appeared for the last time as a separate journal.

8. A meeting of the "unemployed" held in Trafalgar Square, which divided itself into two groups—the "Fair Trade League" and the "Revolutionary Social Democrats." Speeches were made; those to the latter body, by Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, and Champion, being couched in violent language. The better portion of the meeting then dispersed, but others marched by Pall Mall, St. James's Street, and Piccadilly to Hyde Park, breaking the windows of club-houses and private residences, and wrecking and robbing numerous shops, causing damage and loss to the value of 50,000l.

3. The three men Rudge, Baker, and Martin, sentenced to death for the murder of a police constable in connection with the burglary at Netherby 1, hanged at Carlisle. Martin confessed that he had fired the fatal shot.

— Early in the morning about 100 masked men rode up to the gaol at Paris, aa. A dozen dismounted, knocked at the door, and forced an entry. They seized a well-known Texas desperado, R. T. Garrett, who a few days previously had killed Deputy Sheriff Clay-Davis, after having surrendered to 1. The men then rode off with Garrett, and carried him to a place near scene of the murder, and there hanged him.

9. Further assemblages of the "unemployed" in Trafalgar Square, and considerable apprehension of renewed shop-lifting; but, in view of the precautions taken by the police and the shopkeepers, the day passed off peacefully, and the crowd dispersed.

10. A feeling of uneasiness, heightened by the all-pervading black fog, terminated in an absolute panic in the afternoon when the rumour became current that a mob of 50,000 men was marching from Deptford and Greenwich on London, wrecking and looting on the way. No assemblage of disorderly persons, however, took place; but throughout the night a repetition of false alarms kept up the excitement.

11. The elections at the French Academy consequent on the death of About, Victor Hugo, and the Duc de Noailles resulted in the return of Léon Say by eighteen votes out of thirty-two, M. Lecomte de Lisle by twenty-one, and M. Hervé by twenty-three, to the respective *fauteuils*.

— The Attorney-General (Mr. Charles Russell, Q.C.) returned for South Devon by 8,174 votes, against 1,979 polled by Mr. Scoble (Conservative).

at Galway, Captain O'Shea, Mr. Parnell's candidate, defeated Mr. O'Connell, the local Nationalist candidate, by 985 to 65, the latter having practically withdrawn from the contest before the poll was taken.

— Serious rioting took place and was repeated on several days at Leicester when a large number of hosiery hands, out of employ and on strike, attacked the mills, and afterwards inflicted great damage on the tradesmen's shops, &c., in the town.

2. The divorce case of "Crawford v. Crawford and Dilke" heard before Justice Butt, who at once decided that, whilst the petitioner was entitled to a divorce, there was not a vestige of evidence against Sir C. W. Dilke.

— Mrs. Adelaide Bartlett, a young woman of good position, charged with an inquisition by the coroner with having administered to her husband New Year's Eve a dose of chloroform which was fatal in its effects.

— Mr. John Morley (Chief Secretary for Ireland) returned for Newcastle by 1,110 votes, against Mr. Hamond (Conservative), who polled 8,445.

3. Loch Lomond and Lake Windermere completely frozen over, and the rendezvous of numerous Scotch and English skaters.

— Great floods, consequent upon the thaw and loosening of pent-back waters, took place in various parts of the New England States; property to the value of many millions of dollars was destroyed, and thousands of persons in the neighbourhood of Boston rendered homeless.



15. Rioting, unattended, however, by any very serious results, took place at Birmingham and Yarmouth. In the former town a large assemblage had been brought together to listen to the inflammatory address of a Socialist leader, but the presence of a large body of constabulary and soldiers prevented anything like an organised attack upon property. At Yarmouth the corporation had invited the unemployed to apply for work, and they came in such numbers that only a small proportion could be provided with employment. The less fortunate then began rioting, and a few windows were broken.

16. A prize fight for the "Championship of England" and 400*l.* took place between Smith and Greenfield in the neighbourhood of Paris, and was attended by a large number of English who had gone over for the purpose. After an hour's contest, which was much in favour of Smith, the roughs broke into the ring and a draw was declared.

— The General Council of the Social Democratic Federation issued a manifesto inviting a mass meeting of the unemployed in Hyde Park, to demand that the Government should take steps for the general relief of distress.

— The House of Laymen, brought into existence by the House of Convocation, held its first meeting at the National Society's Rooms. Earl Selborne was elected chairman, and Mr. G. Spottiswoode Vice-President. The Archbishop of Canterbury delivered an opening address, indicating the lines on which the laity could usefully co-operate with the clergy.

17. Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, Champion, and Williams appeared before Sir James Ingham, at Bow Street police court, in answer to a charge of sedition preferred by the Treasury.

— Elizabeth Mouat, a middle-aged woman, reached Aalesund, on the coast of Norway, having been blown across the North Sea from Shetland in a smack. She was accompanying two men in a small boat from one island to another, when they were caught by a serious storm; the men were washed overboard, but the woman, being below, escaped the violence of the sea. After drifting about helplessly for several days and nights, during part of which she had lashed herself to the hatchway, she was discerned from the Norway coast, and a means was found to rescue her and bring her safely to land.

— A plot on board the training-ship *Arethusa*, lying in the Thames off Queenhithe, to cut the moorings of the ship and to take her out to sea, was discovered in time. A mutiny, however, broke out among the elder lads, and it was not without difficulty and a prolonged struggle that the officers got possession of the ship, and were able to arrest, punish, and dismiss the ring-leaders.

18. The Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 3 to 2 per cent., the reserve standing at 14,904,000*l.*, or 48½ per cent. of the liabilities, and the stock of gold coin and bullion at 21,570,190*l.*

20. Col. Sir E. Y. Henderson, who for seventeen years had been Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, resigned his post in consequence of the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the rioting on Feb. 8.

21. A mass meeting convened by the Social Democratic Federation held in Hyde Park, at which upwards of 50,000 people attended. Violent speeches were delivered by Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, &c., though the proceedings

quite orderly. After their close, however, the police charged the mob roughly, and provoked retaliatory acts, by which in Grosvenor Place, &c., many persons were hurt.

22. In the Court of Queen's Bench Messrs. Hyndman, Burns, and Chamberlain, the Socialist leaders, applied for an order of attachment against the writer and publisher of *Punch* for contempt of court, in publishing a cartoon representing the three plaintiffs with a rope about their neck, Mr Punch helpfully holding the end of it. Lord Coleridge gave judgment, refusing to accede to the application, and Mr. Justice Hawkins concurred.

— Lord Randolph Churchill enthusiastically received at Belfast by the Orange party, whom he addressed in a large public meeting.

23. The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom held at the Westminster Town Hall under the presidency of Mr. C. M. Monson. It was largely attended by delegates from various countries, and a resolution was unanimously adopted in favour of retaliatory customs duties.

24. The great strike of Tyne and Wear shipwrights, after lasting seven weeks, came to an end, masters and men making mutual concessions, the latter accepting a reduction of one shilling a week on time wages.

— Prince Albert Victor opened the new wing of the Cambridge University Union, added at a cost of 10,000*l*.

26. The Queen came up from Windsor to London to attend a performance at the Albert Hall of M. Gounod's *Mors et Vita*. She was most warmly received along the route and at the Hall.

— Rev. Albert Watson, fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, unanimously elected President of that society.

— In consequence of a notified reduction of 10 per cent. on their wages, upwards of 8,000 men in the employ of Messrs. Nettlefold, of Smethwick, Birmingham, came out on strike, and commenced rioting in the streets and neighbourhood.

27. At the Mansion House Mr. Goschen addressed to the students of both sexes of the London Society for the Extension of University Teaching a very remarkable speech on Hearing, Reading, and Thinking, in which he commented on the hurry of modern life, and the small time it left for thought and study.

— A fire, which at one time threatened to become serious, broke out about midnight in the centre avenue of Covent Garden Market. It was, however, subdued, after destroying two shops at the west end.

28. A Socialist gathering took place during the morning in one of the suburbs of Manchester, but the police were on the alert, and large numbers of constables and soldiers were posted in the neighbourhood, and after a few minutes the meeting, of about 1,200 persons, dispersed. Later in the afternoon a demonstration assembled in far greater strength and set out for Manchester, where a demonstration was made in the principal streets, but little damage done and no broken windows.

— The whole of Lord Trevor's jewellery, which had disappeared four years previously from his house, Brynkinallt, Denbighshire, discovered intact in his garden.

## MARCH.

1. The heaviest fall of snow of the season broke over the greater part of England and Ireland. In London, where skating was still going on in the parks, it lasted for many hours, but the arrangements for clearing away the snow were so much improved that the traffic was not interrupted. The Irish mails, both from and to Holyhead, were delayed two hours by the drifts, and in other parts of the country many trains were completely stopped or snowed up. Numerous ice accidents were also reported, two gentlemen being drowned in the Serpentine and three in Windsor Park. During the snowstorm the American steam liner *Missouri*, with 400 head of cattle and valuable cargo, stranded off Holyhead and became a total wreck.

— At 8 p.m., one hour before the expiry of the truce, peace signed between Servia and Bulgaria.

2. David Roberts executed at Cardiff for the murder of David Thomas near Cowbridge. When the bolt was withdrawn death was not instantaneous, and the gaol governor ordered the chief warder to conduct the press representatives out of the yard. It was asserted that Roberts had lived for nearly three minutes after the drop, but the medical testimony went to prove that it was only muscular action which continued to make the body move.

— M. Pasteur reported to the French Académie des Sciences that out of 350 persons inoculated for hydrophobia his treatment had only been unsuccessful in one case, when the patient was brought too late.

3. At Tornagulla, a small village in the West of Ireland, a party of moonlighters visited the house of a farmer and ordered him on pain of death to forbid his daughter's marriage with an unpopular tenant of a neighbouring estate. The farmer promised compliance.

— A performance of "Hamlet" given at the Horns Assembly Rooms by the South London Deaf and Dumb Dramatic Club, at which about 600 persons, chiefly deaf mutes, were present. The part of Hamlet was acted by Mr. Maguire, and that of Ophelia by Miss Clarmarte. The play scene and the burial of Ophelia were omitted from the performance.

— 4. For three days the traffic on every tramcar line in New York, with seven lines in Brooklyn worked by the Atlantic Avenue Company, was suspended, the companies having reduced the men's wages to \$2 per day of twelve hours. The strike at length terminated, but not without fear of a riot, by the surrender of the companies.

— At Oels, in Silesia, thirty-seven women were preparing flax in a drying house, when a fire broke out, and only two escaped.

— The Fiji Islands visited by a terrible hurricane, which washed away the sea wall at Levuka and made the main street impassable, and wrecked the Royal Hotel, Polynesia Club, and other buildings. At Suva, Rali, and Vuna enormous damage was done by the storm wave and wind.

5. Immediately after the official closing of the Paris Bourse, whilst the building was still crowded with lookers-on, a man in the gallery threw down into the body of the hall a bottle, which produced no other effect than an intolerable

ch. He then drew a revolver and fired three times into the mass of people about him, saying "Vive l'Anarchie!" He was promptly seized by a soldier, and delivered over to the police, who had no small difficulty in bringing him from the crowd, which would have lynched him.

5. Severe snowstorms reported from all parts of the country. In the North snow lay many feet in depth and completely frozen, so as to bear men's weight. On the Welsh mountains from 8,000 to 10,000 sheep were reported as having been lost.

6. The Italian Opera season at Her Majesty's Theatre brought to a sudden end. Gounod's "Faust" had attracted a large audience to the cheaper parts of the house, and the play proceeded without interruption for some time. Between the first and second acts there was a long interval, which tried the patience of the audience; but the solo parts of the second act were received with much applause. A long interval again occurred, and at length, in reply to repeated calls from the audience, the curtain rose, not on the third act, but on the stage crowded with employes declaring that their wages had not been paid. Money was thrown on to the stage from the stalls, and a general commotion ensued. Whilst in the house the public demanded back their money, and, failing to obtain redress, committed a good deal of damage on their way out.

8. A steam tug lying in Cardiff harbour suddenly blew up, killing three of the five persons on board. The boiler was hurled some hundreds of feet in the air, and fell upon the deck of a neighbouring vessel, wounding a man and inflicting serious injury to the hull of the ship.

— Lord Eddesleigh entertained at a banquet at Willis's Rooms by a number of political friends, Liberal and Conservative, belonging to the House of Commons, and presented with a handsome testimonial.

— An inquest held on the body of Edwin Jones, a cutler, living at Hanley, had been found frozen to death on the bank of the Staffordshire Canal.

9. The Queen held an investiture of several orders at Windsor, at which Lord Stanley, M.P., and Admiral Hornby received the Grand Cross of the Order, and many others the insignia of their various ranks and orders.

— A Socialist meeting held at Amsterdam, attended by above 5,000 men out of employ. Resolutions were passed demanding the promotion of public works, the erection of workmen's homes, the reduction of the day's work to ten hours with a payment of fourpence an hour, the imposition of a tax on income to provide the poor with daily bread, &c.

10. Two passenger trains came into collision between Roquebrune and Menton; five of the carriages were thrown off the lines and fell into the sea. Three persons were killed, and nearly thirty injured—some very seriously.

— Didcot Junction, a station on the Great Western Railway, almost destroyed by fire, the origin of which was not discovered.

11. After repeated ineffectual researches a petroleum well struck within a short distance of Suez, close to the sea, within thirty-five metres of the surface, and throwing a jet two metres above the sea-level.

14. The Cunard steamer *Oregon*, on her voyage from Liverpool to New York, run into by an unknown schooner about 18 miles east of Long Island. The sea was smooth and the night fine and clear. The steamer was struck midships, and a huge hole eight feet in diameter made in her side. All the passengers (631) and crew (205) were taken off in safety, but nearly all the mails and passengers' luggage were lost, and the ship went down about eight hours after having been struck. The schooner, with all hands, is supposed to have foundered at once, nothing being seen of her after the collision.

— At Granada, in Spain, and at Wiesbaden, in Germany, strong shocks of earthquake were felt.

15. Mr. Richard Belt, the sculptor to whom the prize design for the Byron monument in Hyde Park was assigned, convicted at the Central Criminal Court on the charge of obtaining money by false pretences from Sir Wm. Abdy, and sentenced to one year's hard labour. The trial lasted over four days.

— Eighteen Russian peasants, who had been bitten (Feb. 28) by a mad wolf in the neighbourhood of Smolensk, arrived in Paris to be submitted to M. Pasteur's treatment for hydrophobia.

16. Severe snowstorms reported from various parts of England, especially from the Midlands. In other parts the frost continued to hold, and skating was general.

— A duel with swords fought near Paris between Prince Amédée de Broglie, second son of the Duc de Broglie, and his brother-in-law, Vicomte de Tredern.

— William "Viscount Hinton," aged 36, convicted at the Central Criminal Court of conspiracy to obtain goods by false pretences, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment with hard labour.

17. St. Patrick's Day, which was celebrated throughout Ireland with more than ordinary ceremony, passed off without a single disturbance or breach of the peace being reported.

— At Carrolltown, Mississippi, during the trial of some negroes for the attempted assassination of a white man, the court house was stormed by fifty whites, who killed thirteen persons attending the court, and wounded several others.

— A party of brigands attacked the Castello di Maniace, the seat of Lord Bridport (Duke of Bronté), in Sicily, and attempted to carry off his son. The attack was repulsed by a smart fusillade, and the brigands were beaten off, leaving four prisoners on the ground.

18. Serious demonstrations of the unemployed took place in Manchester. A large mob assembled round the Town Hall, which, on being moved off by the police, broke up in separate bodies, some of which threatened to pillage the principal shops, and were only prevented by the constant intervention of the police.

— At Liège the anniversary of the Commune of Paris was celebrated by a Socialist demonstration. Crowds joined the procession and attacked shops and cafés, destroying property valued at many hundreds of thousands of francs.



19. In the House of Lords, upon the motion of Lord Thurlow, a resolution was carried by 78 to 62 to the effect that it was desirable to open the national collections of art and literature in the Metropolis on Sundays.

— At the meeting of the Metropolitan Board of Works the financial statement for the ensuing year showed an estimated expenditure of 1,715,000*l.*, and the receipts from rates and the Consolidated Fund at 1,600,000*l.*, in about equal shares. The rentals receivable amounted to 100,000*l.* The rate required was fixed at 7*d.* in the pound, or one halfpenny less than in the previous year.

20. A serious fire broke out near the Eagle Wharf, City Road, on premises used as saw-mills and packing-case factory. A large quantity of timber of various kinds was destroyed, as well as much of the surrounding property.

— The German Emperor attended a gala representation of the Berlin Opera, in honour of his completing his eighty-ninth year, and in anticipation of the birthday fêtes by which his ninetieth birthday was observed throughout Germany.

22. A serious fire broke out in the stables attached to the Brighton Barracks, occupied by the 5th Lancers. The alarm was promptly given, and in spite of a dense fog, which for two days had covered the English Channel and seaports, the men worked at first with success against the fire. The supply of water, however, very soon failed, and all attempts to stop the progress of the flames had to be suspended for a time, and for three hours the fire burned furiously.

— At Plymouth, about midday, the shop of a draper in Tavistock Road, which was undergoing repairs, suddenly collapsed, completely wrecking the shop and burying assistants and customers in the ruins. About twenty persons were thus caught, but only nine received serious contusions.

— The P. & O. Company's ship *Carthage*, fitted with the electric light, successfully passed through the Suez Canal by night.

— By the bursting of a Nordenfelt gun at Hong Kong two men on board H.M.S. *Albatross* lost their lives, and two others were seriously injured.

23. Letters from Lübeck and other German Baltic ports reported the continuance of a winter more severe than had been experienced for many years. The ice in the harbour of Travemünde could not be broken through; the neighbouring island of Rügen was united to the continent, and the ice traversed daily by heavily laden waggons. The Baltic was frozen as far as eye could see, and frequented by numerous sleighs and sledges.

— During the thick fog which for more than three days had prevailed in the English Channel, rendering all navigation dangerous and almost impossible, the Belgian packet *Parlement belge* struck on the Admiralty pier, Dover, when entering the harbour, both ship and pier being severely damaged.

24. The Queen laid the foundation-stone of the Medical Examination Hall of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, to be erected on the Thames Embankment, near Waterloo Bridge.

— According to the Board of Trade returns, it appeared that during the year 1885 the number of persons killed by railway accidents in the United

Kingdom was 997, and 7,022 injured. Six passengers were killed and 436 injured in accidents to trains, &c.; and 96 were killed and 693 injured by accidents from other causes. Of the servants of the companies 13 were killed and 81 injured from accidents to rolling stock, &c.; and 438 killed and 2,036 injured by other causes. Fifty-eight persons were killed and 71 injured at level crossings; and 303 trespassers (including suicides) were killed and 106 injured.

25. Bishop Bagshawe, of Nottingham, having issued a warning to his clergy to refuse absolution to Roman Catholics joining the Primrose League, Cardinal Manning issued a counter-pastoral, declaring that the programme of the League included nothing inconsistent with the duties of a true Catholic.

26. The rioting in Belgium, which had hitherto been confined to the Liège coal district, broke out in the Hainault, especially round Charleroi. The troops were called out to repress the disturbances, which involved the burning of numerous châteaux and the destruction of immense quantities of property. Many of the rioters were shot by the troops, and half a dozen were killed.

— An official return issued showing that out of the 300,000*l.* voted by Parliament for the relief of General Gordon, the total expenditure incurred was 19,179*l.*

27. The resignation of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. G. Trevelyan of their seats in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet formally announced.

— Sir E. Y. Henderson's place as Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police conferred upon Sir C. Warren, who arrived from Egypt to assume the office.

— Prince Bismarck's bill to establish a spirit monopoly in Germany rejected by the Reichstag by 181 to 3 votes, showing, however, that scarcely one half of the entire body (397 members) took part in the vote.

29. Coldbath Fields Prison, having been completely evacuated, was handed over to the Clerkenwell Vestry, by whom artisans' dwellings were to be erected on the site.

— An explosion of 15,000 kilogrammes of gunpowder on the Culebra division of the Panama Canal involved the loss of ten lives and serious injury to forty other persons.

30. A severe gale passed over England, causing damage over a wide area. At Liverpool several buildings in course of erection were blown down; near Wigan a tramcar engine crossing Amberswood was overturned; in North Wales the rain, which fell in torrents, did almost as much damage as the wind; along the East Coast the shipping in the harbours and ports met with serious accidents; and Penzance was visited by one of the heaviest hail and thunder storms known for many years.

31. A vessel lying in the roadstead of the port of Baku, laden with petroleum and benzoline, blown to atoms, and the whole crew, twelve in number, killed.

— About fifty Radical members of the House of Commons signed a letter to the Speaker, expressing the hope that some relaxation in the pre-

bed costume (Court dress) for attending his dinners and levées might be induced. In reply the Speaker expressed the hope of meeting them here Court dress is not the rule."

## APRIL.

1. Mr. Jesse Collings, Secretary to the Local Government Board, and Mr. W. West, Q.C., the Liberal members for Ipswich, unseated for acts of bribery committed by their agents at the general election.

— A very fine solar halo and four mock suns observed in the neighbourhood of Greenwich, lasting with varying brilliancy for about an hour (1.80 to 2.80 p.m.)

— The British Consulate at Damascus destroyed by a fire, which caused great damage to the town.

2. Disturbances occurred at Milan, where several hundreds of workmen assembled before the Duomo to protest against the new *octroi* duties and the consequent increase in the price of bread. They broke the windows of many shops and cafés, and were not dispersed until the military were called out.

— Serious floods reported from various parts of the United States. In Alabama they attained a height of six feet above the highest level ever known. Great loss of life, both among the people and cattle, ensued.

— The Inter-University athletic sports at Lillie Bridge resulted in Oxford winning seven and Cambridge three of the contests.

3. The Abbé Liszt arrived in England on a visit, and was made the object of numerous marks of respect and admiration from all classes.

— The sheriff at Fort Worth, Texas, broke the railway blockade instituted by the Knights of Labour, and started with a goods train westwards. Outside the town a band of strikers was met. The sheriff stopped the train and called on the strikers to disperse. This they refused to do, and both sides commenced firing, resulting in two persons being killed and five seriously wounded. Ultimately the strikers fled, and the road was opened to traffic.

5. In the Queen's Bench Division the Lord Chief Justice gave judgment in the Stepney Election Petition case, to the effect that persons born in foreign countries and not naturalised, whether born before or after her Majesty's accession (when the kingdoms passed under different sovereigns), were aliens, and that they were not qualified to vote.

6. At the Epsom Spring meeting, the Great Metropolitan Stakes won Mr. T. Cannon's Postscript (Robinson), 5 yrs., 7 st. 5 lbs.; 18 started.

— Mr. Caine (Liberal) elected at Barrow by 8,109 votes, against Mr. Mansford Bruce, Q.C. (Conservative), who polled 2,174.

— Discoveries of gold in considerable quantities reported from Kimberley, Western Australia.

7. At the Epsom Spring meeting, the City and Suburban Handicap, 1½ miles, won by Mr. Childwick's Royal Hampton, 4 yrs., 8 st. 4 lbs., defeating the favourite, Lord Ellesmere's Highland Chief, in a field of 17 starters.

7. A fire broke out in the Liverpool Telephone head office, whereby all the instruments were more or less damaged, and telephonic communication through the city suspended for some days.

— A farewell dinner, presided over by the Duke of Cambridge, and attended by Earl Granville and many distinguished persons, given to Mr. Murray Smith, the Agent-General of the Government of Victoria, on the occasion of his recall.

8. Mr. Gladstone explained his Government for Ireland Bill in the House of Commons. The eagerness to obtain seats was so great that members began to arrive at 5.30 A.M., and upwards of sixty breakfasted at Westminster Palace in order to preserve their places by not quitting the precincts of the House.

— The English mail from London to Berlin robbed in transit, and securities to the value of 14,000*l.*, besides other valuable property, abstracted. The robbery was not discovered for some time after the delivery of the bags and boxes in Berlin.

9. A funeral service for the Right Hon. W. E. Forster held in Westminster Abbey, at which there was a large attendance of the personal and political friends of the deceased.

— At East St. Louis the railway workmen on strike began to make fresh disturbances and to impede the course of general business. A riot ensued, in the course of which six of the rioters who attempted to enter the railway depot were shot by the deputy magistrate.

10. About 4 A.M. a fire broke out in the Commercial Department of the Board of Trade, Whitehall Gardens, which at one moment threatened to extend to other parts of the buildings. It was, however, extinguished without much damage except to official documents and correspondence.

— After a trial extending over five days the four Socialists, Messrs. Hyndman, Champion, Burns, and Williams, were acquitted of the charge of sedition, &c., brought against them.

— As Miss Leigh, daughter of Lord Leigh, was driving from Coventry to Stoneleigh about midnight, two persons wearing masks jumped out of the hedge and called out to the coachman to stop, and on his refusing to do so two shots were fired at the carriage, but without doing any damage.

12. The Earl of Morley, First Commissioner of Works, and Mr. Heneage, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, resigned their offices, and the Earl of Kenmare, Lord Chamberlain, and the Earl of Cork, Master of the Horse, also tendered their resignations as members of Mr. Gladstone's Administration, as well as other members of the Household, but were requested to hold them in abeyance pending the settlement of the political questions.

— At a meeting of the French Anthropological Society, M. Matthieu Duval read a paper, in the course of which he stated that the weight of M. Gambetta's brain after death was found to be 1,161 grammes, as compared with 1,829 grammes, the weight of Cuvier's, and 2,000 grammes, that of Cromwell.

13. The Earl of Shaftesbury, in a fit of temporary insanity, shot himself in a cab in Regent Street in broad daylight.

8. Mr. James Gillott, the reporter of a London sporting paper, was fatally bed with a penknife in an hotel at Sheffield by one of two men who had n possession of Mr. Gillott's bedroom and had to be removed by force.

— At Ipswich, where a new election was requisite in consequence of the eating of the sitting members, the two Conservative candidates, Mr. Symple (3,687) and Lord Elcho (3,662 votes), were returned against Lord Hervey (3,635) and Sir Horace Davey (3,627), the Solicitor-General.

14. A densely crowded meeting took place at Her Majesty's Theatre to nounce the legislative separation of Ireland from England. Earl Cowper pieped the chair, and was supported by the Marquess of Salisbury, the quess of Hartington, the Earl of Fife, Mr. Goschen, Mr. W. H. Smith, Mr. Rylands, &c., and after speeches by them and others resolutions were ed condemnatory of the proposal.

— At a special annual meeting the Social Science Association was ally dissolved.

— A serious outbreak of cholera reported from Italy, the district between idisi and Bari being chiefly infected. Upwards of seventy cases, of which had terminated fatally, had come to the knowledge of the authorities.

15. Sank Rapids, Minnesota, a small town on the east bank of the Misippi, almost destroyed by a cyclone, which in the course of the day had elled from Council Bluffs, Iowa, about 350 miles distant. The path of the rwind was about 800 feet wide, but everything which came in its long rse was demolished; houses and trees were swept away, many lives were , and a vast quantity of property and produce destroyed. Northern nesota had been hitherto supposed to be outside the cyclone district, but storm proved more disastrous than any in the surrounding and less ured districts.

17. After a trial extending over six days, Mrs. Adelaide Bartlett, charged h murdering her husband by administering chloroform, was acquitted, the rge against her fellow accused, Mr. George Dyson, a Wesleyan minister, ing been abandoned and his evidence accepted by the Crown.

— A fire at the town of Stry, near Lemberg, in Galicia, broke out in a emaker's shop, at a time when most of the inhabitants were away at a . The fire, fanned by the wind, rapidly extended, ultimately destroying whole town, all the public buildings and churches and between five and hundred houses falling a prey. At least a hundred lives were lost, and 000 were rendered homeless. The fire continued to burn for three days.

— The new deep-sea docks at Tilbury, constructed by the East and West lia Docks Company, at a cost of three millions, opened for use. The first f was cut on July 2, 1882, but the engineering works, by Messrs. Aird and cas, were not commenced until Oct. 27, 1884, since which time about 00 men were constantly employed.

19. Monsignor Martinez Izquierdo, Bishop of Madrid, shot at three times l mortally wounded on the steps of the pro-Cathedral of San Isidro by a est named Cayetano Galeotti, who had been suspended from officiating as ate.

— Prolonged floods, more disastrous than usual, arising from an ice ck, *did enormous damage to the lower parts of the city of Montreal; the*



value of the property destroyed was variously estimated at from five to six millions of dollars.

19. "Primrose Day" celebrated with great enthusiasm in various parts of the country. The Queen sent two wreaths, one of primroses and one of immortelles, to be placed on Lord Beaconsfield's grave at Hughenden.

20. Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, who had left England with the intention of taking up his residence in India, was informed, on his arrival at Aden, that the Government would not permit his stay elsewhere than in the Madras Presidency.

21. A fire broke out in some warehouses in Tooley Street, near London Bridge, and rapidly extended, defying all the efforts of the firemen for many hours. The fire took place in the block of buildings erected on the site of those where Chief Inspector Braidwood had, during a fire in 1861, lost his life.

— Right Hon. Geo. Shaw-Lefevre (Liberal) elected at Bradford, in succession to Mr. W. E. Forster, by 4,407 votes, against Mr. Hoare (Conservative), who polled 3,782 votes.

23. One of the walls of the tidal basin of the Royal Albert Docks removed by blasting. The total length of the wall was 530 ft. and the estimated weight of the materials 7,850 tons. The wall, which had been reduced to about six feet in thickness, was pierced with 1,480 holes, in which charges of gelatine, amounting in the aggregate to 2,860 lbs., had been placed. The whole were fired simultaneously and with complete success, only half a dozen blocks being hurled out of the water.

24. A revolt took place in the Vincent St. Paul Penitentiary at Montreal where upwards of 1,000 convicts were confined. Having seized the chief warder and sixteen of the guards, they possessed themselves of their arms and obtained for a time complete possession of the interior of the prison. The revolt was not subdued until sixteen of the convicts had been shot; but Mr. Laviolette, the governor, was severely wounded.

— The south wing of Trafalgar House, Lord Nelson's residence, near Salisbury, totally destroyed by a fire, which originated in the roof.

26. Friedland, in Moravia, a large and flourishing town, nearly destroyed by fire, which originated in an inn, and owing to the high wind spread rapidly, involving the loss of many lives and rendering the majority of the inhabitants homeless.

— The Metropolitan volunteers held their annual manoeuvres at Dover and Portsmouth, the Duke of Cambridge and Lord Wolseley taking part in those at the former place.

27. Madame Astie de Valsayre, a lady who had already distinguished herself by her duel with Miss Shelby, addressed a challenge to Miss Booth, "la Maréchale" of the Salvation Army, as the propagator of pernicious doctrines.

28. The Two Thousand Guineas Stakes at Newmarket won by the Duke of Westminster's colt Ormonde, 8 yrs., 9 st., by two lengths, defeating a field of 6 starters. Time, 1 min. 46½ sec. Value of the stakes, £4,000.

— Defalcations to the extent of upwards of £37,000 discovered in the

accounts of the actuary of the Cardiff Savings Bank. He had held the post for nearly twenty-five years up to the time of his death.

28. A fire broke out in a public-house in Beak Street, Regent Street, which resulted in the death of three of the inmates, two being burnt and the third killed in jumping from a second-floor window.

— The temperature, which for a week had of a sudden become that of the height of summer, as suddenly fell from 69° at midday to 39° before sunset.

— Brigittenau, a German village near Stry, in Galicia, destroyed by fire.

29. The Anglo-Scotian Mills at Beeston, near Nottingham, totally destroyed by fire, together with a number of the surrounding cottages and outbuildings. The entire loss was stated to exceed 150,000*l*.

— The walled portion of the city of Mandalay set on fire, and a tract of nearly a mile in length by 500 yards broad completely destroyed.

## MAY.

1. May Day celebrated, under the auspices of Mr. Ruskin, by a grand ceremony at the Whitelands Training College, Chelsea; and at Knutsford, Cheshire, by the crowning of a May Queen.

3. Mr. Gladstone issued, in the form of an address to his constituents in Midlothian, a manifesto declaratory of the reasons which had induced him to bring in his measures relating to Ireland.

— Sir Charles Dilke addressed a large meeting of the Liberal electors of Chelsea, whom he had invited to hear a public statement with reference to the divorce case to which he had been made a party. A unanimous vote of confidence and sympathy was passed.

— The men on strike at Chicago for the eight hours' system broke into open violence, and attacked the McCormick Reaper Factory. The building was defended by the police, and in the struggle which ensued five strikers and four policemen were shot.

4. The Colonial and Indian Exhibition at South Kensington opened by the Queen in state. Alighting at the Colonial Hall, her Majesty was conducted through the Indian Hall and Court, and then entered the Albert Hall where the inaugural ceremony took place.

5. A mutiny broke out among the prisoners in the Paris prison of La Santé Roquette. The gaolers were attacked, and three of them, as well as the governor, wounded before order was restored by the troops, who were sent for.

— At Milwaukee a mob of strikers, chiefly Polish, attacked the Bay View Mills, where 12,000 hands had refused to join the eight-hours strike. The militia interfered, and after calling upon the mob to withdraw fired, killing five and wounding many more. The strikers fled, and after one or two abortive attempts to rally dispersed.

— The Chester Cup won by the Duke of Beaufort's Eastern Emperor, 8 st. 2 lbs.

6. Prince Albert Victor of Wales opened the International Exhibition at Edinburgh.

— The Grand Theatre at Derby totally destroyed by fire just before the commencement of the performance. An explosion of gas at the back of the stage was the cause of the fire, which at once seized upon the scenery. There were only about a score of persons in the theatre, and these escaped with less difficulty than the actors, two of whom were fatally injured.

— The Bank of England advanced its rate of discount to 3 per cent.

7. The representatives of the various European Powers left Athens, and a blockade of the Greek coast by the allied fleet declared on the following day.

— According to a return presented to Parliament it appeared that, in the 66 contested elections held at the General Election in Ireland, out of 450,906 voters 92,822 were returned as illiterate.

— The American fishing schooner *David Adams* seized by the Canadian authorities for buying bait in Digby Harbour, Nova Scotia, in violation of the Canadian Customs and Fisheries Act and in contravention of the Convention of 1818.

8. Philip Gosset, treasurer of the Jersey States, after a trial lasting the whole week, found guilty of misappropriating 27,000*l.* public money, and condemned by the Island Court to five years' penal servitude.

10. A memorial to Sir John Goss unveiled in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral by Sir Arthur Sullivan.

— The Government announced that a commercial convention had been concluded with Spain, in which, in return for fixing the alcoholic scale for the minimum wine duties at 80 deg., Spain agreed to give the most favoured-nation treatment to British manufactures.

— A service of banqueting plate, consisting of twenty-three circular bowls of hammered work, weighing 524 oz., and bearing the London date marks 1581 to 1602, sold by auction by Messrs. Debenham, Storr, & Co. for 1,255*l.* The plate originally belonged to Sir Christopher Harris, of Radford, Devon, and after the assault on his house by the Puritans in 1645 it disappeared until 1827, when it was turned up by a plough in a neighbouring field.

11. The Queen, who had left Windsor Castle soon after midnight, arrived at Liverpool at 8 A.M., and was conducted to Newsham House. At 8 P.M. she entered Liverpool in state and opened the International Exhibition of Navigation and Commerce. In spite of the bad weather the streets were crowded, and the Queen received a most enthusiastic welcome.

— A terrible storm of wind and rain prevailed at Kansas city, Missouri. Twenty-four persons were killed, including eleven children, who were buried in the wreck of the school-house. The Span Bridge across the Missouri River was completely destroyed.

12. A fire broke out at a public-house known as "Jacob's Well," in the Inn Yard, Shoreditch, and two men and a woman, sleeping on the premises, were burned to death; and at Frampton House, Well Street, Hackney another fire, an old woman and young child also lost their lives.

12. A hurricane of extraordinary violence, accompanied by hail and , burst upon the city and outskirts of Madrid. About 70 persons were ed and 200 injured ; a portion of a church was blown down and great age done to the public parks, tram cars, and cabs.

— All over the United Kingdom severe weather was experienced. Rain in heavy quantities throughout England, causing floods in Yorkshire, shire, Wales, and the Midlands ; a violent gale raged over Cumberland, stmoreland, and the Irish Sea ; the hills in the Lake district and the South cotland were covered with snow.

13. Severe cyclones occurred in various parts of the United States ving eastwards about Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Brooks e swollen in a few minutes into torrents, carrying away houses, trees, and nals ; railway trains were wrecked by the washing away of embankments, numerous lives were lost.

14. A terrible hurricane swept over the town of Krossen, in the province bradenburg, blowing down a church tower, unroofing numerous houses, and ing ships in the river to founder. Lonato, near Brescia, was also visited he cyclone and five persons killed, and in the south of France in the hbourhood of Montpellier great devastation was caused.

— A performance of Shelley's "Cenci" took place at the Imperial Theatre, gton, under the auspices of the Shelley Society.

15. Two ladies and one gentleman out of a party of six drowned by the etting of their boat, which was carried by the force of the stream nst the danger post above Bray Weir. One of the ladies was carried over weir, but ultimately rescued.

— Another series of cyclonic storms passed over Indiana and Ohio. The t destructive, formed on Lake Erie, entered Ohio at the Indiana border and elled more than 100 miles before its force was spent. The damage e during the week throughout the Union was estimated at upwards of five ion dollars.

17. A posthumous son to King Alfonso born at Madrid, and from his h was hailed as King of Spain and named Alfonso XIII.

— Mr. Stirling, junior, Equity Treasury Counsel, appointed Judge of the ncery Division in succession to Mr. Justice Pearson. Mr. Stirling was or wrangler and first Smith's prizeman in 1860.

— On the return of H.M.S. *Calypso* to Sheerness Dockyard, having ten down in her trial cruise, some tons of water poured out of her ; and as found that she had been imperfectly caulked and her keel only single-ed.

18. Mount Etna suddenly exhibited great activity, throwing up large ntities of vapour and cinders on the western side of the central crater. esequently huge columns of flame issued from various places, and streams ava seriously threatened the village of Monterosso.

19. Alderman Jaehne, of the New York Board of Aldermen, convicted of ng a bribe in connection with the passing of the Broadway Tramway me, and sentenced to nine years and ten months' imprisonment.

20. Hostilities suddenly broke out at the Greek and Turkish outposts near *ipsis*, and in the engagement the advantage rested with the Greeks.

20. The largest fire known in Exeter broke out in the rooms of a cabinet-maker in Fore Street, and rapidly spread to the surrounding buildings. Property to the value of 40,000*l.* was destroyed before the fire was extinguished.

— The Czar addressed to the officers and men of the Black Sea fleet an order congratulating them upon the resuscitation of Sebastopol, where he had previously launched ironclads, opened docks, and laid the foundation-stones of a new arsenal.

21. Alderman Hamilton, of Poole, when leaving the town hall, was shot at several times by a young man named John King, who at once gave himself up to the police. Mr. Hamilton died in less than an hour.

— The Queen came to town to visit the Colonial Section of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, and after spending some hours in the various courts returned to Windsor.

22. Nationalist riots occurred at Pesth in consequence of certain Austrian officers depositing wreaths on the pedestal of the monument erected to the memory of General Hentzl and 418 Austrian soldiers who fell in 1849 while defending the fortress of Buda against General Görgey's Honveds.

— A large shipment of fresh fruit, consisting of grapes, pears, oranges, &c., from South Australia and New South Wales reached the market for colonial produce held in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition at South Kensington.

23. The business premises of the *Toronto Mail* destroyed by fire, entailing damages estimated at 100,000 dollars. The paper nevertheless was published as usual on the following morning.

24. The matches for the sculling championship of England and 400*l.* rowed over the Thames course by George Perkins, of Rotherhithe, and Neil Matterson, of Sydney, New South Wales, and won by the English oarsman.

25. The great heat of the previous week followed in various parts of the Continent by serious thunder-storms. Waterspouts broke over Bordeaux and Wetzlar, doing enormous damage. In Saxony and Thuringia two rivers rose so rapidly that many persons were drowned and several hundred head of cattle were washed away.

26. The Derby won by the favourite, the Duke of Westminster's Ormonde (F. Archer), defeating Mr. Peck's The Bard easily, whilst the next horse, Sir Mirin, was two lengths behind. There were only nine starters.

— An important discovery of gold made at Kimberley, in Western Australia.

27. In consequence of the defective sanitary arrangements of the House of Commons the sitting was abruptly closed, the offensive smells proving intolerable.

28. Herr Most, the editor of the *Freiheit*, published in New York, and two other American anarchists tried and convicted for inciting to riot. Herr Most was sentenced to one year's imprisonment.

— The Oaks won by the favourite, the Duke of Hamilton's Miss Jumm— defeating a field of thirteen.

— *Bell's Life in London*, the oldest established sporting newspaper in the world, ceased to appear after having existed sixty-four years.



29. The Prince and Princess of Wales opened the new bridge over the Thames between Fulham and Putney, constructed by the Metropolitan Board of Works at a cost of 240,000*l.* to replace the old wooden bridge.

— A man named Penny, but known as "Old Neptune," fined 5*l.* for pretending to be an astrologer and advertising to cast nativities, &c.

— The statue of John Hunter, presented by the Queen to the Oxford University Museum, unveiled by the Princess Christian.

30. The Australian Steam Navigation Company's steamer *Ly-ee-moo* wrecked off Green Cape on her voyage from Melbourne to Sydney. Out of eighty-five persons on board only fifteen were saved.

— A serious attack made in Dublin upon the men of the Scots Guards in garrison there, and many of them seriously injured by the mob.

31. In digging the foundation of a building in Upper Kirkgate, Aberdeen, a bronze pot was discovered about three feet below the surface, containing above 15,000 silver coins of the reign of Edward I.

— The French Chamber voted, without discussion, a grant of 200,000 francs for the foundation of the Pasteur Institute for the treatment of hydrophobia.

— The *Pall Mall Gazette* published a remarkable statement showing the disposition and organisation of the "Orange Army" in Ulster, stated to number upwards of 78,000 enrolled volunteers.

## JUNE.

1. Canon Liddon elected Bishop of Edinburgh by 44 votes to 4 in succession to Bishop Cotterill, deceased. Dr. Liddon telegraphed from Pera his inability to accept the office conferred upon him.

— The Most Rev. Robert Knox, of Connor, Down, and Dromore (1849), enthroned in the Cathedral of Armagh as the first Primate of the Disestablished Church of Ireland and the 106th successor of St. Patrick.

— Two French ships of war which had sailed from New Caledonia for the New Hebrides, on pretence of protecting some French settlers at the latter island, landed troops and hoisted the French flag.

2. President Cleveland married at 7.30 p.m. at the White House, Washington, to Miss Folson. The ceremony was strictly private, only the members of the Cabinet being invited in addition to the families of the bride and bridegroom. This was the first occasion of a President of the United States having been married during his term of office.

3. M. Vandersmissen, representative for Brussels and leader of the "Independents" in the House, sentenced to fifteen years' penal servitude for "culpable homicide," having shot his wife, from whom he was publicly seeking a divorce whilst continuing to visit her secretly.

4. A riot took place at Belfast between the Protestant shipbuilders at Messrs. Harland's yard and the Roman Catholic navvies employed at the Alexandra. The attack was made by the former in order to revenge an assault upon a Protestant workman, and after a short fight, in which the navvies were overwhelmed and put to flight, order was restored, but not until one of their body had been forced into the river and drowned and many injured,

4. The eruption of Mount Etna, which commenced on May 18, after engulfing many woods and vineyards, suddenly ceased, the lava having advanced to within a few hundred yards of the town of Nicolosi.

— Henry Andrews, alias Robert King, who was arrested for having in his possession a number of Russian 100-rouble notes, and being concerned in the robbery of the mail train on the South-Eastern Railway on April 5, found guilty and sentenced to eight years' penal servitude. It was almost conclusively proved that the van containing the Berlin mail had been entered between London and Dover whilst the train was in motion, and that the mail and registered letter bags had been opened and their contents abstracted and sewn up again without any suspicion being aroused.

5. Traffic on all the tramways in New York, Brooklyn, and the suburbs stopped by a general strike of all the unionist men, numbering nearly 15,000.

— A waterspout broke over the town of Nancy, deluging the streets and destroying goods in the shops and warehouses to the value of 20,000*l*.

6. The Grand Prix de Paris won by the favourite, Mr. Vyner's Minting (F. Archer), defeating the two horses Upas and Sycomore, which had run dead heat for the French Derby, and five other competitors, including Miss Jummy, the winner of the English Oaks.

7. The second reading of the Irish Home Rule Bill negatived by 841 to 811.

— At Rouen a gentleman whose wife had run away from him recognised her whilst singing in the theatre. Drawing a pistol, he shot her dead upon the stage.

— The blockade of the Greek coast by the Great Powers raised in view of the disarmament and pacific assurances of the Hellenic Government.

— A sculling match for the championship of the Thames between David Godwin, of Battersea, aged 40, and Neil Matterson, of Sydney, N.S.W., aged 22, resulted in the defeat of the Englishman.

8. Serious disturbances reported from various places in the South of Ireland, consequent upon the rejection of the Home Rule Bill, the Protestant Unionists in most instances celebrating their victory in a manner offensive to the Catholics and Nationalists. At Lurgan a riot took place, and several houses and shops belonging to Roman Catholics were sacked.

9. Rioting renewed at Belfast, and the military called for, but not until the police had fired upon the mob, killing five persons and seriously wounding many others. A Roman Catholic chapel was attacked, the Orange party being the cause of the disorders. Disturbances also took place at Lurgan, Coleraine, &c., Ulster generally being in an excited state.

— A great Socialist meeting held at the Hague to protest against the prosecution of Herr Nieuwenhuis for high treason. After a few speeches the hall was cleared by the police without resistance.

— A serious volcanic eruption took place on the east side of the Tarawera Lake, New Zealand, by which the Maori village of Wairoa was destroyed and buried under ten feet of ashes. Ten Europeans and upwards of 100 natives lost their lives.

10. The Bank of England reduced its rate of discount from 8 to 2½ per cent., the reserve being 11,899,000*l.*, or 89 per cent. of the liabilities.

— A proclamation of Prince Leopold of Bavaria, countersigned by all the ministers, promulgated, announcing his assumption of the Regency on account of the state of the King's health.

— Madame Patti and Signor Nicolini married at the English church in the village adjoining their residence, Craig-y-Nos Castle, near Swansea.

— A monument to King Frederick William IV. unveiled at Berlin in presence of the Emperor and a distinguished assembly.

11. The debate in the French Chamber on the Bill for the expulsion of the Princes (Orleanist and Bonapartist) concluded by the acceptance of M. Broussé's proposal in favour of limited expulsion.

— Among the races at Ascot the following were the principal events:—

Ascot Stakes.—Lord Ellesmere's Belinda (J. Woodburn), 5 yrs., 7 st. 11 lbs. Eleven started.

Prince of Wales's Stakes.—Duke of Beaufort's Button Park (G. Barrett), 3 yrs., 8 st. 10 lbs. Nine started. (After a dead heat with Mr. J. H. Houldsworth's c. by Springfield—Morgiana.)

Gold Vase.—Mr. D. Baird's Bird of Freedom (F. Archer), 4 yrs., 9 st. Five started.

Royal Hunt Cup.—Mr. Gilbert's Despair (C. Coates), aged, 7 st. 13 lbs. Fourteen started.

Ascot Derby.—Mr. Manton's St. Mirin (G. Barrett), 3 yrs., 8 st. 13 lbs. Seven started.

St. James's Palace Stakes.—Duke of Westminster's Ormonde (F. Archer), 3 yrs., 9 st. Three started.

Gold Cup.—Baron de Hirsch's Althorp (T. Cannon), 4 yrs., 9 st., defeating Bird of Freedom. Three started.

Bous Memorial Stakes.—Mr. J. Hammond's St. Gatien (C. Wood), 5 yrs., 9 st. 5 lbs. Six started.

Hardwicke Stakes.—Duke of Westminster's Ormonde (G. Barrett), 3 yrs., 7 st. 12 lbs. Five started. Lord Hastings's Melton (F. Archer) ran second.

12. The strike at Decazeville, after lasting nearly four months, ended in the surrender of the company to the miners; an increased rate was promised, and the obnoxious officials dismissed.

— The canal designed to drain Lake Copais, near Thebes, in Bœotia, opened in the presence of the French ambassador and a distinguished deputation from Athens.

— Serious riots, arising out of a wanton outrage on the Roman Catholic bishop's palace, took place at Sligo. A large Roman Catholic mob attacked the houses of the principal Protestant residents, smashing windows and doors and firing several shots. The police being unable to restrain the rioters, the military were called out, and at length cleared the streets.

13. King Ludwig of Bavaria, whilst walking in the park of Starnberg Castle, to which he had been removed, threw himself into the Lake of Starnberg. Dr. von Gudden, his physician, attempting to save or restrain him, lost his life in the struggle which ensued. The two bodies were not discovered until some hours afterwards.

14. The town of Vancouver (British Columbia) almost totally destroyed by fire. Twenty persons were burnt to death and many injured, whilst upwards of 8,000 were rendered homeless.

14. Mr. James Lennox, of Dumfries, completed a bicycle run from Land's End to John o' Groat's—885 miles—in a total riding time of 6 days 8½ hours, beating the best previous record by seven hours.

15. The final results of the Belgian elections showed that by the biennial renewal of one half of the Chamber the New Chamber would consist of ninety-eight Clericals and forty Liberals.

— The elections in Nova Scotia resulted in the return by large majorities of Liberal candidates in favour of separation from the Dominion of Canada.

16. A renewal of strikes reported from the mining districts of Mons, Belgium.

— The discovery by Mr. Flinders Petrie of "Pharaoh's House in Taphnès" (cf. Jeremiah, chap. xlv.) reported to have been made in a group of mounds called Tell Defenneh—the Pelusiac Daphnæ—in a corner of the north-eastern delta of the Nile.

17. Mr. Gladstone left London for Midlothian by the Midland Railway, receiving enthusiastic ovations at St. Pancras, Leicester, Trent, and other stations where the train stopped.

— Prince Victor Napoleon, whilst driving in the Bois de Boulogne, Paris, thrown from his carriage, and severely injured in the head and arms.

— Serious riots, attributed to the anarchists, occurred at Zürich, involving serious injuries to many of the police as well as to the rioters.

18. At Rome, in honour of the fiftieth anniversary of the formation of the Corps of Bersaglieri, a bust of General La Marmora, the founder of the corps, unveiled on the Janiculum Hill.

— The county of Armagh and the greater portion of the county of Tyrone "proclaimed" under the Peace Preservation Act.

— Mr. Gladstone at Edinburgh and Lord Salisbury at Leeds addressed large meetings on the question to be laid before the constituencies at the approaching elections.

— The Manchester Cup won by Sir R. Jardine's Riversdale, 8 yrs., 6 st. 1 lb., defeating The Bard (8 st. 4 lbs.) and five other starters.

— According to official returns the total number of divorces pronounced in the French capital during the year 1885 was 1,242, of which, however, only 121 were new cases, judicial separation having been previously obtained in the others.

19. Before the House of Lords Committee on the Manchester Ship Canal it was stated that Messrs. Lucas and Aird had offered to undertake the work for 5,750,000*l*.

— The funeral of King Ludwig II. of Bavaria took place with great pomp in St. Michael's Church at Munich, and was attended by the Crown Princes of Austria and Germany and representatives of all the Great Powers.

— The British expeditionary force under Colonel Gordon in Burmah met with serious resistance when attacking Bosweh at Maphe, and only after severe loss dislodged the enemy; and on the same day Major Haines failed to dislodge 1,500 Burmese near Tumenvoo, and had to retire after five hours' fighting.

20. The entry of the Queen upon the fiftieth year of her reign celebrated a special form of service, prescribed by the Archbishops and Bishops to their respective dioceses.

21. The Prince of Wales, accompanied by the Princess of Wales and their family, laid the first stone of the Tower Bridge, designed at a cost of £10,000, to cross the Thames near Wapping without impeding the navigation of the river by large ships.

— The Spanish Cortes rejected, by 227 votes to 17, a proposal to grant Home Rule to Cuba.

— Severe floods, in many cases arising from the bursting of numerous water-spouts, reported from many parts of Central Europe. Silesia, Northern Bohemia, and Thuringia were the chief sufferers.

22. The French Senate, after two days' debate, passed the Princes' Expulsion Bill by a secret vote of 141 against 107, the first clause of the bill, decreeing the compulsory exile of the Comte de Paris, Prince Napoleon, and their eldest sons, having been previously passed by an open vote of 137 to 122.

— The Prince of Wales visited Brighton to assist at the installation of the Duke of Connaught as Grand Provincial Master of the Freemasons of Essex.

— The 250th anniversary (or fiftieth lustrum) of the founding of the Utrecht University celebrated with great rejoicings in that city.

23. Prince Napoleon and his son left Paris, the latter for Geneva and the former for Brussels, the Comte de Paris remaining at the Château d'Eu until the following day, when he and his family left for Tunbridge Wells.

— The Irish Nationalists, under the chairmanship of Lord Sandhurst, held a public meeting in St. James's Hall, which was numerously attended, Mr. Sexton, the principal speaker, being warmly received.

— Snow fell in the Hebrides, completely covering the ground in many places.

24. The Lord Mayor and Sheriffs attended the Guildhall in state to open the new Art Gallery, composed for the most part of pictures presented from time to time by Aldermen to the Corporation, and previously hung in the Council Chamber and at the Mansion House.

— The steamer *Victoria*, conveying the Comte and Comtesse de Paris and their eldest son, arrived at Dover, their departure from the Château d'Eu and their embarkation at Tréport having been marked by great demonstrations of regard.

25. The Prince and Princess of Wales opened the new wing of Queen Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital, one of the oldest voluntarily supported charities in England.

— The single session of the Queen's eleventh Parliament prorogued by Royal Commission.

— The Lord and Lady Mayoress entertained the representatives of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition at a grand reception at the Mansion House. The Corps Diplomatique and the leading members of both Houses of Parliament were invited to meet them.



26. The Queen held a Council at Windsor, when a proclamation was issued dissolving Parliament and ordering another to meet on August 5.

— The cholera, which was reported on the decline at Venice, suddenly broke out in the district of Ferrara, where thirty-eight deaths in two days were reported.

— Mr. Henry Irving, at the invitation of the Vice-Chancellor, lectured in the "New Schools" at Oxford upon the English drama and its four chief exponents, Burbage, Betterton, Garrick, and Edmund Kean.

28. The Prince and Princess of Wales visited the East End of London, in order to lay the foundation-stone of the Queen's Hall, a portion of the People's Palace of Recreation, to be erected from funds originating in a bequest by Mr. Beaumont in 1838, supplemented by 20,000*l.* given by the Drapers' Company and about 40,000*l.* subscribed by the public. The Prince and Princess were most enthusiastically received on their way to Bancroft's Hospital, Mile End Road, where the ceremony took place.

— The infant King of Spain "presented" by his mother to the Virgin at the Church of the Atocha in grand state.

— The R.M.S. *Tagus* driven ashore near Bahia, but after an interval of two days was floated into harbour; the crew and passengers meanwhile had escaped by taking to the boats.

29. At a banquet given by the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House to the principal persons connected with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition the Prince of Wales expressed his belief that the Exhibition would form an epoch in the reign of the Queen, and hoped that by some means a permanent Colonial Exhibition might be formed in London.

— The French Government notified to England that France had assumed the protectorate of the Comoro Islands.

30. The Queen went from Windsor to Egham to open the Royal Holloway College for Women, a magnificent institution capable of accommodating 400 girl students. In addition to 1,000 rooms there are a museum and library, a picture gallery (containing pictures valued at 100,000*l.*), gymnasium, lecture theatre, racquet courts, all erected and endowed by the late Mr. Thomas Holloway (patent medicine vendor) at a cost of 800,000*l.*

— The Prince and Princess of Wales opened a new wing to the Royal Victoria Hospital at Chelsea.

— The General Election commenced by the unopposed return of three members for different divisions of Liverpool.

— Mr. John Bright and Dr. Wendell Holmes were amongst the distinguished persons upon whom the degree of Honorary D.C.L. was conferred at the Oxford Commemoration.

— A serious accident happened at Knockbridge, on the Great Northern Railway of Ireland, from a train leaving the line in consequence of the rails having expanded under the excessive heat of the weather. Four persons were killed and twenty injured.

## JULY.

1. The Premier of Tasmania and three other members of the Government injured in a railway accident, caused by the train leaving the line about twenty miles from Hobartown.

— The express train from Berlin to Stuttgart ran into a passenger train coming in the opposite direction, near Schweinfurth. Twenty persons in the latter were killed and many in both trains seriously injured.

— The Prince of Wales installed at the Brighton Pavilion as Grand Master of the Mark Masons.

2. The Queen held a military review at Aldershot in honour of a number of Colonial and Indian representatives in this country. About 15,000 men of all arms were engaged.

— A terrific explosion of about 2,500 lbs. of dynamite occurred at the Atlantic Dynamite Co.'s Works, M'Cainsville, New Jersey. Of ten men in the bursting room no recognisable fragment was found, and a dozen others were wounded. The concussion was felt to a distance of twenty miles.

— A Royalist demonstration took place at Marseilles on the occasion of the anniversary of the cessation of the plague of 1720. At Lyons serious disturbances were occasioned by the riotous conduct of the glass-workers on strike. In both cities the police, after making a number of arrests, dispersed the crowds.

3. The cholera, which was reported to be abating in Venice, declared itself at Fiume and other places on the Dalmatian coast.

— The Marchese Pallavicini and M. Cromelin, Secretary to the Dutch Legation, accompanied by two guides, lost their lives in attempting the ascent of the Gross Glockner. Their bodies were found some days afterwards in a ravine on the north side; apparently one of the party had slipped when within a few hundred feet from the summit, and the whole party were carried over the precipice, nearly 4,000 feet.

5. The 500th anniversary of the battle of Sempach celebrated with much enthusiasm at the scene of the battle, and a statue to the memory of Arnold von Winkelried erected on the shore of the Sempach Lake, unveiled by the President of the Swiss Republic.

— The Commission of Enquiry into the Daira Scandals at Cairo found Khalif Pasha and six subordinates guilty of breach of trust and embezzlement, and censured the English controller.

— The first direct passenger train on the Canadian Pacific line reached Port Moody, on the Pacific, punctually, having left Montreal on June 28 with about 70 passengers.

— The Queen entertained at luncheon, at Windsor Castle, 250 Colonial and Indian visitors.

6. Serious election riots took place at Dublin, the Conservative Workmen's Club and the Orange Lodge being selected for attack by the mob. The occupants threw bottles, stones, &c., from the windows, and then fired several shots. One man was picked up dead, but whether from natural

causes or not was not clearly shown. About thirty-five persons were injured and conveyed to the hospital. Riots also took place at Londonderry and Cardiff.

6. The Cabinet of St. Petersburg notified that, the 59th clause of the Treaty of Berlin notwithstanding, Batoum ceased to be a free port.

— Bidel, the most celebrated lion-tamer in France, had a narrow escape at Neuilly. When alone in the cage with his largest lion Bidel's foot slipped and he fell; the lion immediately rushed on him, seizing him by the arms and neck. Bidel did not lose his presence of mind, but struggled with the lion until two of his assistants entered the cage, and after a short combat the animal turned tail, and Bidel, though severely injured, was removed.

7. A statue of Lamartine, by M. Marquet de Vasselot, unveiled at Passy by the Minister of Fine Arts in the presence of a large assembly.

— A fire took place at the University of Brussels, the ancient palace of Cardinal Granville, by which the Academic Hall, the library, and the laboratories were entirely destroyed, and damage done to the extent of one million francs.

— The Oxford and Cambridge cricket match concluded, Mr. K. J. Key's score of 148 in the second innings being the largest ever made in a University match. The score was :—

OXFORD.											
First Innings.						Second Innings.					
Mr. K. J. Key, b Toppin	.	.	.	.	6	c Marchant, b Rock	.	.	.	143	
Mr. E. H. Buckland, b Rock	.	.	.	.	15	b Rock	.	.	.	3	
Mr. W. Rashleigh, b Rock	.	.	.	.	21	c and b Rock	.	.	.	107	
Mr. H. V. Page (captain), c Kemp, b Rock	.	.	.	.	20	c Rock, b Bainbridge	.	.	.	2	
Mr. J. H. Brain, c Orford, b Rock	.	.	.	.	17	c Bainbridge, b Rock	.	.	.	8	
Mr. L. D. Hildyard, b Toppin	.	.	.	.	12	l-b-w, b Bainbridge	.	.	.	5	
Mr. H. T. Hewett, b Rock	.	.	.	.	0	b Bainbridge	.	.	.	7	
Mr. A. R. Cobb, st. Orford, b Toppin	.	.	.	.	50	c Knatchbull-Hugessen,					
						b Rock	.	.	.	9	
Mr. H. T. Arnall-Thompson, b Toppin	.	.	.	.	6	b Toppin	.	.	.	4	
Mr. A. H. J. Cochrane, c Rock, b Buxton	.	.	.	.	6	c Toppin, b Dorman	.	.	.	7	
Mr. H. O. Whitby, not out	.	.	.	.	11	not out	.	.	.	0	
Byes, 20; l-b, 6; w, 1	.	.	.	.	27	Byes, 6; l-b, 1; w, 2	.	.	.	9	
Total	.	.	.	.	191	Total	.	.	.	304	

CAMBRIDGE.											
First Innings.						Second Innings.					
Mr. H. W. Bainbridge (captain), c Hildyard, b						c Arnall-Thompson, b					
Cochrane	.	.	.	.	44	Buckland	.	.	.	79	
Mr. C. D. Buxton, c Arnall-Thompson, b Page	.	.	.	.	30	c Cobb, b Buckland	.	.	.	27	
Mr. G. Kemp, b Cochrane	.	.	.	.	5	c Cobb, b Whitby	.	.	.	19	
Mr. C. W. Rock, run out	.	.	.	.	20	b Whitby	.	.	.	27	
Mr. J. A. Turner, b Cochrane	.	.	.	.	0	c Brain, b Cochrane	.	.	.	21	
Mr. F. Thomas, l-b-w, b Arnall-Thompson	.	.	.	.	13	c Page, b Buckland	.	.	.	1	
Mr. F. Marchant, l-b-w, b Whitby	.	.	.	.	20	b Arnall-Thompson	.	.	.	3	
Mr. C. Toppin, b Whitby	.	.	.	.	8	c Cobb, b Buckland	.	.	.	2	
Mr. L. Orford, c Cobb, b Whitby	.	.	.	.	8	b Arnall-Thompson	.	.	.	15	
Hon. C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen, c Cobb, b											
Arnall-Thompson	.	.	.	.	0	not out	.	.	.	0	
Mr. A. W. Dorman, not out	.	.	.	.	0	b Buckland	.	.	.	4	
Byes, 5; l-b, 3	.	.	.	.	8	Byes, 4; l-b, 2; w, 2	.	.	.	8	
Total	.	.	.	.	156	Total	.	.	.	206	

Umpires: Farrands and Wheeler.

The Queen at Windsor Castle received a number of natives of her dominions, who had come to take part in the Colonial and Indian exhibition. Presents of gold and silver were offered by those from India, Ceylon, and by the Cingalese, &c.

The Henley Regatta extended under the new rules to three days; in consequence of not more than two boats being allowed to contest any heat ended with the following results:—

Grand Challenge Cup.—Trinity Hall B.C., Camb., beat Oxford Etonians by one-third of a length.

James Challenge Cup.—London R.C. beat Thames R.C. by one length.

Visitors' Challenge Cup.—First Trinity B.C., Camb., beat Clare Coll. B.C. easily.

Diamond Challenge Sculls.—F. S. Pitman, Third Trinity B.C., Camb., beat W. S. Unwin, Magdalen Coll., Oxford, easily.

Ladies' Challenge Cup.—Pembroke Coll., Camb., beat Eton Coll. R.C. by half a length.

Silver Goblets.—F. E. Churchill and S. D. Muttelbery, Third Trinity B.C., Camb., beat D. H. and H. Maclean, New Coll., Oxford, by half a length.

Steward's Challenge Cup.—Thames R.C. beat Trinity Hall B.C. by two lengths.

Wyfold Challenge Cup.—Thames R.C. beat Trinity Coll. B.C., Oxford, by two lengths.

As the French Chamber was about to adjourn a man in the gallery fired a revolver, of which the bullet struck the wall about two yards from President Floquet's head.

The Eton and Harrow cricket match at Lord's terminated in favour of the former by six wickets. The score was:—

HARROW.

First Innings.			Second Innings.		
Crawley, b Bromley-Davenport	40		b Brand	69	
S. F. Fair, c Hoare, b Gosling	28		c Green, b Mordaunt	61	
J. Daughlish (captain), c M'Lachlan, b Bromley-Davenport	24		c Duckworth, b Bromley-Davenport	10	
D. Mackie, b Brand	4		b Mordaunt	4	
M. Torrens, c Gosling, b Brand	4		b Brand	6	
F. Hutton, c Gosling, b Bromley-Davenport	0		c Brand, b Bromley-Davenport	12	
D. Ramsay, b Bromley-Davenport	7		c Llewelyn, b Bromley-Davenport	11	
G. Arbuthnot, b Bromley-Davenport	9		not out	25	
F. Kemp, b Brand	7		st. Duckworth, b Brand	0	
E. Holmes, not out	6		c Hoare, b Brand	7	
A. MacLaren, b Mordaunt	0		b Bromley-Davenport	0	
Byes, 1; 1-b, 8	4		Byes, 5; 1-b, 10	15	
Total	133		Total	220	

ETON.

First Innings.			Second Innings.		
P. Foley, c Kemp, b Ramsay	114		c MacLaren, b Arbuthnot	38	
D. Llewelyn, b MacLaren	8		b MacLaren	44	
J. Mordaunt (captain), c Fair, b Daughlish	20		b Ramsay	9	
C. Gosling, b Arbuthnot	21		c MacLaren, b Ramsay	34	
H. Coventry, b Arbuthnot	9		not out	17	
S. Green, b MacLaren	1		not out	7	
H. Hoare, c Crawley, b Arbuthnot	1				
C. M'Lachlan, b Ramsay	0				
W. Brand, b Ramsay	0				
H. Duckworth, c and b Ramsay	20				
R. Bromley-Davenport, not out	4				
Byes, 2; 1-b, 2	4		Byes, 1; 1-b, 6	7	
Total	202		Total	154	

Umpires: West and T. Mycroft.

11. An English cooper, named Graham, residing at Buffalo, constructed a large ballasted barrel in which he could stand upright; this he entered and caused to be placed in the river below the Niagara Falls. Having safely passed the whirlpool, he opened a man-hole, and was carried through the rapids to Lewiston, which he reached unharmed.

12. The anniversary of the battle of the Boyne celebrated by the Orange clubs throughout Ulster without disturbance, except at Coalisland, near Dunganannon, where a collision took place between the Orangemen and Nationalists; and at Belfast, where, however, there was no actual breach of the peace.

— The Duc d'Aumale expelled from France in consequence of his having addressed a letter to President Grévy protesting against being struck off the French army list.

13. The match for the Lawn Tennis Championship between Mr. W. Renshaw and Mr. W. Lawford, the winner of the Gold Prize, took place at Wimbledon, and ended in Mr. Renshaw's winning by three sets to one, or 23 games to 14. Mr. Renshaw having held the challenge cup since 1881, it now became his absolute property.

— In Belfast an Orange procession, headed by a band, was assailed when passing through a "Catholic" street, but the assailants were beaten off. In the evening mobs of both parties came into collision. The police and soldiers vainly attempted to separate them. One constable and a private soldier were shot dead, and upwards of 100 persons, chiefly police, were seriously wounded, and throughout the night the rioting was continued.

14. The National *fête* of the French Republic celebrated in Paris and throughout France. The President reviewed 40,000 troops at Longchamps, when the regiments recently returned from Tonquin were warmly welcomed.

— For the Liverpool Cup Mr. L. de Rothschild's Middlethorpe, 6 yrs., 8 st. 8 lbs., and Mr. A. Benholm's Perdita, 5 yrs., 7 st. 8 lbs., ran a dead heat, defeating eleven others.

15. A second destructive fire occurred at Vancouver, British Columbia, by which nearly all that part of the town which had escaped the previous conflagration was destroyed.

16. The funeral of Cardinal Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, took place in presence of large crowds, which showed the greatest respect and sympathy.

17. A duel took place in the park of Meudon between General Boulanger, the French Minister of War, and Baron de Lareinty, a Royalist Senator, in consequence of certain words spoken by the latter during a debate in the Senate. M. de Lareinty fired without effect, and the General's pistol missed fire and was handed to one of his seconds, whose efforts to discharge it were unsuccessful until the third attempt.

— The elections brought to a close throughout the United Kingdom, except Orkney and Shetland.

19. Serious disturbances occurred at Marseilles, the crowd attacking the offices of the principal Royalist newspapers.

— Important changes made in the pay and privileges of the Imperial family of Russia, and the income of all members, excepting that of the Emperor himself, reduced by two-thirds. The Empress in future was to



give 200,000 roubles per annum, the Czarewitch 100,000 roubles and his wife 50,000 roubles, and the other members of the family in proportion.

19. Fourteen sailors belonging to H.M. gunboat *Goshawk* drowned in Port Royal, Jamaica, by a boat capsizing in a storm.

20. At a meeting of the Cabinet Council held in Downing Street it was resolved to place the resignation of the Government in the hands of the Queen.

— The railway to Merv, connected with the Transcaspian line, completed; to be used only for military purposes.

— Messrs. Rothschild invited subscriptions for 765,000 shares of 10*l.* each for the construction of the Manchester Ship Canal, but after a few days' interval the scheme was withdrawn for want of public support.

21. In Labrador a snowstorm accompanied by intense cold set in and lasted two days, during which much anxiety was felt for the Indians and settlers on the mainland.

22. The Norfolk estates of the Marquess of Cholmondeley offered for sale at public auction under an order of the Court of Chancery. For Houghton Hall (built by Sir Horace Walpole at a fabulous cost) and 10,564 acres of land 1,000*l.* was offered, but was not accepted.

23. A naval review held in the presence of the Queen and the Empress Eugénie at Portsmouth in honour of the Colonial and Indian representatives. A somewhat serious accident happened to a party of the guests who were being conveyed round the dockyard in open trucks. The engine left the rails, and upwards of twenty passengers were thrown out and more or less injured.

— The Eclipse Stakes, value 10,000*l.*, run for at Sandown Park and won by H. T. Barclay's Bendigo, 6 yrs., 9 st. 7 lbs. Twelve started.

— After a trial extending over seven days the intervention of the Queen's counsel in the case of Crawford v. Crawford dismissed with costs. Sir Charles Russell forthwith issued his farewell address to the electors of Chelsea, announcing his retirement from public life.

24. About 100 cases of dynamite and a quantity of gunpowder exploded aboard a sloop lying in Havre harbour. The town museum was damaged, many of the neighbouring ships injured, and very many windows broken. Several persons were hurt by pieces of the vessel which fell at long distances from the explosion.

— The funeral of Hobart Pasha, whose body, at the request of the Sultan, had been brought to Turkey, took place. After a procession through the streets of Galata the body was conveyed to Scutari and there interred.

— The Wimbledon meeting of the National Rifle Association terminated.

25. Serious rioting took place in Amsterdam on two successive evenings, consequent upon the attempt on the part of the police to put a stop to a cruel long-established custom of eel-snatching in the canals. The police having failed to disperse the crowd, the military were called out, but before order was restored twenty-five persons were shot and upwards of ninety wounded, including forty policemen.

— In the Middlesex Sheriff's Court a special jury assessed at 5,000*l.* the damages in an action brought by Mr. Cyrus Field against Mr. James Gordon Bennett for libel contained in two false statements transmitted from London and published in *New York*.

26. Direct telegraphic communication opened between England and the West Coast of Africa.

27. A meeting of the Conservative members of both Houses of Parliament held at the Carlton Club to hear from Lord Salisbury a statement of the circumstances under which he had accepted the task of forming a Ministry.

— The directors of the Sea Beach Railway, New York, having invited the Brazilian Prince Dom Augusto to visit Coney Island, a steamer was reserved for the invited guests. As the vessel was nearing the docks on its homeward trip a woman called attention to a packet resembling a large bottle with a burning fuse attached. A sailor at once seized it and threw it overboard, so that it was not possible to ascertain its contents; but previous to starting the directors had received a communication from the "Social Revolutionary Committee" threatening those who took part in the fête.

— With the polling for Orkney and Shetland the general elections finally closed.

28. A serious fire broke out in Skinner Street, Finsbury, by which the large warehouses of Messrs. Lilley & Skinner, wholesale boot manufacturers, were burnt down, and the adjoining premises seriously damaged.

— The bath in which Marat was stabbed sold by a priest of the diocese of Vannes to the manager of a Paris exhibition for 5,000 francs. It had been bequeathed to him by Mademoiselle Cabriol de Saint-Hilaire, who died 1862, aged 86.

— In excavating the ground where Cannon Street Road and Cable Street, St. George's in the East, meet, some workmen discovered, about six feet from the surface, the skeleton of a man with a stake through it, and a portion of chain lying near the bones. It was believed that the skeleton was that of a man who hanged himself in the Coldbath Fields Prison in 1811, when under remand on a charge of having committed seven murders, and referred to by De Quincey in his well-known essay on "Murder as a Fine Art."

29. The quinqucentenary fêtes of the Heidelberg University inaugurated by the reopening of the Students' Hall, which had been splendidly restored. The subsequent entertainments included a grand reception of the representatives of foreign universities and nations, in whose name Professor Zeller, of Paris, responded to the hearty welcome accorded to visitors.

The International Chess (Masters') Tournament terminated in favour of Mr. Blackburne and Mr. Burn, of Liverpool, the latter taking his place among the "Masters" for the first time.

30. The principal races at Goodwood were decided as follows:—

Stewards' Cup.—Captain Machell's Crafton, 4 yrs., 7 st. 11 lbs. (Edwards).  
Twenty-five started.

Gratwicke Stakes.—Duke of Westminster's Whitefriar, 3 yrs., 8 st. 11 lbs. (F. Archer). Three started.

Chesterfield Cup.—Mr. Childwick's Saraband, 3 yrs., 8 st. 5 lbs. (C. Wood).  
Sixteen started.

Sussex Stakes.—Mr. G. Lambert's Chelsea, 3 yrs., 8 st. 5 lbs. (J. Goater). Six started.

Corinthian Plate.—Mr. W. M. Redfern's Camlet, 5 yrs., 8 st. 8 lbs. (C. Wood).  
Seven started.

Goodwood Cup.—Mr. R. Peck's The Bard, 3 yrs., 7 st. 7 lbs. (C. Wood). w.o.  
Chichester Stakes.—Mr. D. Baird's Offspring, 5 yrs., 6 st. 11 lbs. (Warne).  
Eleven started.

Goodwood Stakes.—Duke of Beaufort's Winter Cherry, 3 yrs., 7 st. (Clemenson). Seven started.

30. M. L'Hoste, a French aëronaut, accompanied by M. Maryot, having left Cherbourg in a balloon shortly before midnight, descended at Tottenham to the residence of Mr. Coxwell, the English aëronaut, at 6.30 A.M., just seven hours after starting. Use had been made of a floating bucket, by which water for ballast was, when required, drawn up to the balloon; and a small sail, about five yards square, enabled the travellers to slightly direct their course.

31. An attempt made by three men to break into St. Marylebone Parish church. A desperate struggle ensued between a policeman and the burglars, one of whom at last drew a revolver, fired four shots, wounding the policeman, and enabled all to escape.

— Another fatal riot took place at Belfast, in the course of which the police, after having been severely stoned, were ordered to fire, one of the shots killing a boy, aged twelve. The Orange mob then attacked the houses of a number of Roman Catholic publicans and private persons.

— On the resignation of the Liberal Ministry peerages were conferred on Sir Thos. Brassey, K.C.B. (Lord Brassey of Bulkeley); Sir M. A. Bass, Bart., M.P. (Lord Burton); Mr. J. C. Hamilton of Dalzell; and Sir Henry Irving, K.C.B.

## AUGUST.

1. At Dieppe four men killed and three seriously injured by the explosion of a boiler connected with the dredger used in the harbour.

— At Constantinople a desperate attempt to murder the Grand Vizier was made by a Tartar named Halil Agha, from Adrianople, who fired two shots into the carriage in which the Vizier was sitting, and failing in his attempt drew a short dagger, tried to overtake the carriage, but without success.

2. At the Newcastle-on-Tyne Police Court the Earl of Lonsdale fined fifty shillings for an assault upon Mr. David de Bensaud (the husband of the dress Miss Violet Cameron), who had forced his way into his wife's room.

— A new shaft sunk in the Channel Tunnel works at Dover, in connection with some valuable mineral discoveries made at Calais.

3. Lord Aberdeen, on quitting Dublin at the close of his Viceroyalty, was accorded a remarkable ovation. The Nationalists, the trades organisations, and town councils from all parts of Ireland arranged themselves in procession, and a farewell address was presented by the Lord Mayor of Dublin.

— H.M.S. *Orlando*, a new type of ship, which combined great strength, power, and speed with the power to remain at sea a long time, launched at Messrs. Palmer's Jarrow yard.

4. Serious rioting renewed on this and the previous evening in the streets of Belfast, the police and military being required in each case to disperse the mobs.

— Pierre Brochard, a Dominican monk and a doctor of divinity, tried at Roubaix on the charge of having, by the aid of false keys, opened the safe containing the money and securities of the Dominican monastery at Lille,

having abstracted about 40,000 francs' worth of property. After the robbery he left his monastic dress on the bank of a river, across which he

swam, in order to suggest the idea of suicide. His counsel, who was also a Dominican brother, argued that, according to civil law, there had been no robbery, all things being in common in a monastery. Brochard had only taken prematurely his share of the fund (valued at 40,000*l.*) The jury, in spite of the protest of the judge, adopted this theory and acquitted Brochard.

5. The twelfth Parliament of the present reign opened by Royal Commission, and on the return of the members of the Lower House from the House of Lords Sir E. Birkbeck proposed, and Mr. Gladstone seconded, the re-election of Mr. Peel as Speaker.

— A meeting of the Liberal Unionists held at Devonshire House, under the presidency of Lord Hartington.

6-10. For five days the town of Belfast was the scene of desperate rioting and street fighting between the Nationalists and Orangemen. In spite of large bodies of military and police guarding the principal thoroughfares the 'Island' men, the original aggressors, on returning from work were set upon in North Street. The police, on interfering, were received with a shower of missiles, and the troops were called upon to disperse the rioters. In Townshend Street a more formidable outbreak occurred, the police using their firearms and severely wounding seven persons. Very similar outbreaks continued on the two following days, except that the police were the chief objects of the mob's fury, and the result was that eight deaths were officially reported to have occurred, besides innumerable woundings. Several more deaths occurred during the disturbances, and the total number of those seriously wounded exceeded 120.

7. A fresh and violent outbreak of cholera, involving sixty-eight deaths, took place at Barletta, on the Adriatic.

— At Cupar, Fife, an immense shower of flies, somewhat larger than the ordinary house fly, completely covered about 600 yards of the road leading to the railway station. The flies when they fell were quite dead.

— The centenary of the publication of the first edition of the poems of Burns celebrated at Kilmarnock, where 30,000 people assembled. The address was delivered by Mr. J. H. Stoddard of Glasgow.

8. Two coopers passed through the Niagara Rapids in a torpedo-shaped barrel, and after an hour's interval reached the smooth water unharmed.

9. Mary Ann Britland executed at Manchester for the murder of Ann Dixon, whom she had poisoned with some vermin-killer. She was, moreover, charged with, and did not deny, having murdered her husband and daughter in a similar way.

— Rev. Dr. Dowden elected Bishop of Edinburgh in connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church; in the Clerical Chamber thirty voted for and one against him, and in the Lay Chamber twenty-one for and three against him.

— A hail-storm of extraordinary violence passed over north-eastern France, and although it only lasted a quarter of an hour vines and fruit trees were completely stripped of their leaves and fruit. The hailstones averaged an ounce in weight, and covered the ground in places to a depth of six inches. At Rheims great damage was done to the stained-glass windows of the cathedral, and at Nogent-sur-Marne the destruction of property was almost incredible.

10. A great portion of the town of Skien, in Thelemarken, destroyed by fire.

— Alfred Packer, one of the six miners who in 1874 were isolated in their camp on the site of Lake City, Colorado, tried at New York. Their provisions having been exhausted, Packer killed and ate his companions, and then became for years a fugitive. He was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to forty years' imprisonment.

11. Nearly all the members of the new Administration re-elected without opposition.

— The Lord Mayor entertained the Prime Minister and the principal members of the Government at the Mansion House.

12. The "Relief" of Derry, with its procession of the "apprentice boys," commemorated by the Orangemen. Ill-feeling showed itself at an early hour, and two bottles charged with gunpowder, with lighted fuses, were thrown among the train-bands, but fortunately neither exploded. Crowds of Nationalists had collected in the streets, but were kept in check by the police and military.

— The town of Sillescu, in Hungary, almost entirely destroyed by fire, 400 houses, the church, nunnery, and public school being completely burned down.

13. A terrible colliery accident happened at the Wood End, or Bedford, Colliery, near West Leigh, Lancashire, by which thirty-eight lives were lost, only two escaping of those who had been working in the part of pit where the explosion of firedamp occurred.

14. Rioting again renewed at Belfast, and, in spite of the elaborate precautions taken by the police and military, a determined fusillade was kept up between the contending parties, some firing from the windows of houses, whilst others, who had gained experience as members of a local rifle club, came forward as sharpshooters for their party. The house of a publican at the corner of Ashmore Street was struck in more than thirty places. The police and military, using the butt-end of their rifles, at length cleared the streets, but not until after many persons had been seriously and even fatally injured. The actual casualties could not be ascertained, as both sides carried off their wounded.

15. A great demonstration of Belgian working-men, in favour of universal suffrage, from all parts of the country, and numbering upwards of 25,000 men, took place in Brussels, and passed off in a most orderly manner.

16. A series of naval manoeuvres, under the command of Admiral Sir Wm. Hewett, commenced at Milford Haven, and after lasting three days it was decided that the attacking force had been successful.

— For the Newtown Division of South-West Lancashire Mr. T. Wodehouse Leigh (Conservative) was elected by 4,062 votes against 3,555 polled by Mr. Daniel O'Connell French, Q.C. (Gladstonian Liberal). The vacancy was caused by the elevation of Sir R. Cross to the peerage.

— The race for the bicyclists' championship of Europe was decided at the Berlin Congress in favour of Mr. E. Hale, of the Gainsborough Bicycle Club, who did the distance (10,000 mètres) in 19 min. 3 sec., defeating Herr *David*, of Hanover, by a few seconds. The championship of Germany was



won by Herr Pundt, of Berlin, over the same course in 19 min. 30 sec. The tricycle championship of Europe was won by Herr Kiderlen, of Delft, who subsequently, in an extra bicycle race of 2,000 mètres for foreigners, defeated Mr. Hale.

16. The Island of St. Vincent visited by a terrible hurricane, which in the course of two hours caused damage to the buildings and trees to the extent of 30,000%.

17. The centenary of the death of Frederick the Great celebrated by a service in the garrison church of Potsdam, at which the Emperor William was present.

— As the President of the Republic of Uruguay was entering the theatre at Monte Video he was fired at point blank by a man armed with a revolver, who, however, only inflicted a slight flesh wound on the President's cheek. The would-be assassin was seized and so maltreated by the crowd that he died almost as soon as he was rescued by the police.

18. The Irish National Convention, attended by about 1,400 delegates, met at Chicago, and elected as chairman Judge James Fitzgerald, a supporter of Messrs. Sullivan and Egan. Mr. Egan subsequently delivered the presidential address.

— Josef Pircher, a journeyman gilder, for a wager climbed to the top of the golden pinnacle of St. Stephan's Cathedral, Vienna, and planted on it an imperial flag with a garland of flowers in honour of the Emperor's birthday. He commenced his ascent shortly before midnight, accomplished his wager, and reached the ground in two hours and thirty-three minutes. After an enthusiastic reception by the crowd which had assembled he was led off to the police station. The height to the cross is 432 German feet 6 inches.

— The Queen arrived in Edinburgh from Osborne and took up her residence at Holyrood. In the course of the day she visited the International Exhibition in state.

19. Parliament opened by Royal Commission for the despatch of business.

— In accordance with the finding of the coroner's jury nine policemen arrested at Belfast on the charge of wilful murder in connection with the recent riots.

20. A fire broke out at Dudgeon's Wharf, in the Isle of Dogs, and an extensive range of buildings, occupied by the London Oil Storage Company, completely destroyed.

— Sentence of death passed upon Spiess and six other anarchists implicated in the Chicago riots.

21. In the middle of the night a party of officers, who had previously corrupted the sentinels, forced their way into the palace at Sofia, seized Prince Alexander of Bulgaria, and attempted to extort from him his signature to an act of abdication. On his refusal to comply he was hurried off and conveyed on board a steamer, and eventually landed at Reni, on Russian territory.

— At Leith Mr. Munro-Ferguson, and for the Burton Division of Staffordshire Mr. Evershed, both Gladstonian candidates, were returned by large

majorities, and Sir M. White Ridley (Conservative) for the Blackpool Division of Lancashire.

22. An ex-policeman named Kendall went through the Niagara Rapids with no other assistance beyond a cork life-preserver. He was severely lashed and much exhausted by his five minutes' course, during which he swam over a mile.

23. Dr. Drought, the English clergyman at Chantilly, ordered to quit France for having presented an address of sympathy to the Duc d'Aumale on the occasion of his expulsion.

— The Provisional Government of Sofia issued a proclamation declaring the deposition of Prince Alexander a necessity. A rival Government was, however, at once established at Tirnova by the friends of the Prince. The Bulgarian militia was called out, and, supported by popular feeling, upset the Sofia Government and arrested the principal conspirators.

— An international Trades Union Congress assembled at Paris to examine the political and economic situation of working-men in the various countries of Europe.

25. At King's Lynn Mr. A. W. Jarvis (Conservative) polled 1,428 votes against Mr. T. H. Sanders's (Gladstonian) 1,168.

— Mr. Gladstone, on the eve of his departure for Bavaria, issued his pamphlet on the Irish question, divided into two parts—the "History of the Idea" and the "Lessons of the Election."

27. The thousandth anniversary of the incorporation of the city of London celebrated with great rejoicings, in which the civil and ecclesiastical authorities took part. An historical pageant at Fountains Abbey formed part of the *fêtes*.

— A terrible earthquake, of which the centre was apparently some twenty miles south of the island of Patras, felt throughout the Peloponnesus. Argos, Achaia, Gargaliano, and Filiatra, in Messina, and numerous villages in Arcadia were laid in ruins. Patras suffered severely, and altogether 300 persons were lost, and double that number of persons severely injured.

28. Prince Alexander arrived at Giurgevo, and at once left for Bucharest, where he was warmly received.

30. Messrs. Laffin & Rand's magazine, situated in an open prairie on the outskirts of Chicago, containing 100,000 lbs. of dynamite, powder, &c., exploded by lightning. Four persons were fatally injured, and everything in the distance of half a mile was wrecked.

— A large meeting of Welsh farmers took place at Pentre Celyn to consider the action they should adopt towards the rectors of parishes who had given notice of their intention to distrain for tithes.

— A volcano on the island of Galita, between Sardinia and Tunis, observed to be in active eruption.

— Shocks of earthquake felt at Smyrna and in other parts of the Levant.

31. A terrible earthquake, extending from the Atlantic west to Omaha, and north to Detroit and south to Mobile, visited the United States. Charleston, South Carolina, suffered the most severely, the greater part of the city being

laid in ruins. Ninety-six persons lost their lives, and property to the value of 8,000,000 dollars was destroyed. The shocks were renewed on the following day.

81. The centenary of M. Chevreuil, the French chemist, and for many years director of the Gobelins manufactory, celebrated in Paris with great enthusiasm.

## SEPTEMBER.

1. The annual meeting of the British Association opened at Birmingham, when Sir J. W. Dawson, principal of the M'Gill University, Montreal, delivered the inaugural address on the origin and history of the North Atlantic Ocean.

— The Severn tunnel, which had occupied thirteen years in construction in consequence of the difficulties presented by the land springs on the Monmouth side, opened for goods traffic.

— The final heat of the International Sculling Match rowed from Putney to Mortlake, when Beach (Sydney, N.S.W.) easily defeated Teemer (U.S.A.), having the race in his hands after the first mile. The money was divided as follows: Beach, 1,200*l.*; Teemer, 400*l.* Bubear and Matterson, 112*l.* 10*s.* each; Perkins, Lee, and Ross, 50*l.* each.

2. The bathing establishment at Schevening, near the Hague, destroyed by fire, originating in the fall of a lighted lamp. The entire building, comprising an hotel, kursaal, assembly room, and casino, was in a few hours wholly consumed.

— The 200th anniversary of the delivery of Buda-Pesth from the Turks who were besieging it celebrated with great rejoicings.

— A serious outbreak of cholera took place at Torre dell' Annunziata, near Naples.

3. Prince Alexander of Bulgaria reached Philippopolis, where he was enthusiastically received by the population, and after a short stay started for Sofia, and after a warm reception all along the route made his state entry into the latter city.

— Two fresh shocks of earthquake felt at Charleston, but the streets were gradually cleared of the débris and railway communications resumed. Shocks were also felt at various places along the Atlantic coast, but did no damage. Similar phenomena were observed for upwards of a week along the whole west coast of the Peloponnesus, where the people had taken to living in tents.

4. Severe thunderstorms occurred in various parts of England, chiefly in the western and southern districts. At Swansea 8,000 tons of earth were carried away from Kilvey Hill by the rush of water occasioned by the bursting of a waterspout.

6. The Trades Union Congress met at Hull. After Mr. J. Maudsley, the retiring president, had addressed the meeting on the state of the labour market, Mr. Maddison, the president of the year, delivered the opening speech, urging the Congress to take up a more propagandist policy. In the course of its session it passed resolutions in favour of free elementary education, of

increase in the number of sanitary inspectors, of the appointment of workmen as county magistrates and railway inspectors, and against the opening of museums, &c., on Sundays.

6. Mr. J. G. Lowe, a Manchester merchant, found dead in a railway carriage on the arrival of the express train from St. Pancras at Leicester. A revolver was found on the footboard of the carriage, and there was evidence of an apparent struggle.

7. At the meeting of the Edinburgh Town Council the Lord Provost read a telegram from Mr. Andrew Carnegie, of New York, increasing his previous offer of 25,000*l.* for a free library for Edinburgh to 50,000*l.*

— New colours presented at Devonport to the 1st battalion 7th Royal Fusiliers, by Lady Albertha Edgcumbe, daughter of the Earl of Mount Edgcumbe, Lord Steward; and for the first time since the Reformation the colours were blessed by the Roman Catholic chaplain.

— Fresh shocks of earthquake felt at Athens and in many parts of Greece.

— Prince Alexander of Bulgaria telegraphed to the Czar and to the Sultan his determination to abdicate at once.

— The first race over the New York Yacht Club course ended in the victory of the American yacht *Mayflower* over the English *Galatea* by twelve minutes.

8. Prince Alexander left Sofia, after addressing a proclamation to the Bulgarian people, in which he stated that he abdicated for the good of the country.

10. An explosion of firedamp took place at Dean Lane Colliery, Bedminster, Bristol, by which ten men out of a total of 100 in the working were killed and many others seriously injured.

— Tregaron, a small township in Cardiganshire, suddenly inundated to a depth of four or five feet, the river having overflowed its banks in consequence of a severe storm.

11. The Emperor of Germany held a grand military parade at Strasburg, where he was received with better feeling by the population than on his previous visits.

— In the race (run at Preston) for the four-mile championship and 200*l.*, George retired after 8½ miles, and Cummings finished alone in 20 min. 35 sec.

— In the second race for the International Yacht Championship the American yacht *Mayflower* easily defeated by three miles, on a course of twenty miles out and home, the English yacht *Galatea*.

12. A number of English fishing smacks, principally belonging to Colchester, detained at Havre by order of the Maritime Commissary for infringement of the international fishing laws. The law forbids English fishing vessels to enter French ports, except to revictual or by stress of weather, but it had fallen into desuetude since 1848.

— During early mass at the pilgrimage church at Radna, in Hungary hangings of one of the side altars caught fire. The church was crowded with worshippers, who rushed to the door. In the panic which ensued fifteen persons lost their lives and a large number were seriously injured.

18. The *Volta*, a small launch propelled by electricity, crossed the Channel from Dover to Calais in 8 hrs. 51 min., and made the return journey in 4 hrs. 15 min. The object of the owners was not to make a quick passage, but to test the storage power employed. It was found on reaching Dover that the supply remaining was ample.

— The Chancellor of the Exchequer laid on the table of the House of Commons a Treasury minute setting forth the grounds for the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the Civil Service.

14. At Doncaster for the Champagne Stakes Mr. Zetland's Panzerschiff (J. Watts) ran a dead heat with Lord Ellesmere's Grandison (G. Barrett), and the Great Yorkshire Handicap was won by Mr. I'Anson's Selby, 4 yrs, 7 st. 1 lb. (F. Barrett). Six started.

— An excursion train from Erie to the Niagara Falls came into collision with a freight train near Silver Creek, New York State; the smoking car was completely telescoped, and sixteen passengers were killed.

— A serious riot took place at Galway on the arrival of Father Fahy and the other persons committed to prison for having threatened a farmer at Woodford. The crowds assembled in large numbers, and the police had to charge with fixed swords in order to clear a way for the prisoners.

15. The St. Leger Stakes won by the Duke of Westminster's Ormonde (F. Archer), who defeated his six opponents with the greatest ease.

— A portion of Albert Bridge, over the Lagan, at Belfast, suddenly collapsed, carrying with it about a dozen persons, of whom four were killed.

— At Ostrau, Moravia, as a body of uhlans were about to cross the bridge spanning the Ostravitza, it suddenly gave way, and three soldiers and fourteen civilians were drowned.

— At the Welsh Eisteddfod, held at Carnarvon, the Lord Mayor of London received as a "Bard" by the presiding Druid and formally invested with the insignia of his rank.

— A slight earthquake shock felt at Charleston.

16. Important discoveries announced to have been made in excavating the Acropolis of Mycenæ, and portions of a building supposed to have been the palace of the Atridæ laid bare.

17. An attempt made by an innkeeper to assassinate the Roumanian Premier, M. Bratiano, as he was returning home from a Cabinet Council. The shot, fired from a revolver, missed M. Bratiano, but wounded M. Robesco, a deputy, who was walking with the Premier.

[— The Earl of Dalkeith, whilst deer-stalking in Achnacary Forest, met with a fatal accident. In pursuing a stag he had shot he slipped on the steep ground, and before he was able to throw away his rifle it had gone off, lodging the bullet in his body. He only lived a few minutes.

— Cholera broke out among the foreign colony at Vladivostock, and in the course of the week seventy-three cases were reported and thirty-nine deaths.

18. The Viceroy of Ireland (the Marquess of Londonderry) made his state entry into Dublin, and was favourably received by the bulk of the people assembled in the streets through which the procession passed.

— An exciting race took place between Beach, the Australian, and Gen.



laur, a champion American sculler. The course was from Putney to Mortlake. At Hammersmith Beach was leading by three lengths, at Chiswick they were level, and shortly afterwards Gandaur was leading by two lengths, Beach apparently rowed out. He made another effort, and at Barnes Bridge overtook his rival, and passed the winning post three lengths ahead.

20. The correspondence between the Prince of Wales and the Lord Mayor published suggesting the establishment of a Colonial and Indian Institute to commemorate the Queen's Jubilee. The Lord Mayor promised his co-operation and to open a public subscription.

— In Madrid about 200 soldiers, supported by a few civilians, attempted to effect a republican rising. Although the authorities were taken unawares the insurgents were unable to make any head, and after a few street skirmishes escaped in a train to Alcala, where they hoped to gain over the garrison. They were, however, hotly pursued by the royal troops and nearly all taken prisoners, including Brigadier-General Villacampa, who had placed himself at the head of the revolutionary movement.

— Rioting again renewed in Belfast, the Roman Catholic mob attacking the prison in which one of their body had been locked up. Two persons were killed and many wounded by the police, and it was not until the military had cleared the streets that quiet was restored.

21. The "Cabinet Noir," instituted in the reign of Louis XIV. for the purpose of exercising a surveillance over the letters of suspected persons passing through the post office, abolished by a formal decree. Under the reign of Napoleon III. it employed 22 agents, and its cost, upwards of 600,000 francs per annum, was paid out of the Secret Service money.

— Renewed earthquake shocks, accompanied in some cases by detonations, felt in various parts of Georgia, North and South Carolina, and in the neighbourhood of Charleston.

22. An attempt to grow tobacco in England, in consequence of the relaxation of the Excise laws, proved a fair success. The spot chosen for the experiment was at Plaistow, in Kent, and on an acre of ground 4,840 plants were grown, some of the leaves measuring 27 inches in length by 18 inches in breadth.

— News arrived of the discovery of large and promising gold-producing districts in the Transvaal, Tasmania, and Queensland.

— At the Camberwell Board of Guardians a poor woman, of respectable appearance, who gave the name of Caroline Guelph and claimed to be a daughter of George IV., applied for outdoor relief. She stated that she was born in 1816 in Vienna.

23. The funeral of Mrs. Girling, the "mother" of the Quaker community which for many years had occupied a plot of ground in the New Forest, took place in the parish churchyard of Lymington. The community, which had been reduced to twenty members, subsequently dispersed.

24. A column erected in the Prater at Vienna to the memory of Admiral Tegethoff, who commanded at the battle of Lissa, unveiled in the presence of the Emperor and Imperial family.

— A colliery explosion occurred at Essen, in Germany, by which forty-five lives were lost.

25. A statue of Grotius, the eminent Dutch jurist, unveiled at Delft in the presence of the Ministers of the Interior and Foreign Affairs and a large assemblage of jurists of all nationalities.

— A terrible and novel accident occurred at the blasting of the Crarae Granite Quarries, on Loch Fyne. As customary on the occasion of a "monster blast," a large deputation, including many members of the corporation, arrived from Glasgow. Seven tons of gunpowder had been employed. When the signal had been given from the steamer below, between 60,000 and 70,000 tons of granite were dislodged. After a short interval as many of the visitors as desired were landed to view the quarry, and about 800, including many ladies, availed themselves of the privilege. A few minutes later members of the party at all points seemed suddenly overpowered and fell motionless to the ground, whilst others went into convulsions. Before the experts had time to realise the danger of the situation nearly 100 persons had fallen to the ground, overcome by the choke-damp, and of these six were quite dead before they could be removed.

— Parliament prorogued by Royal Commission.

— A sculling match for the championship of the world and 1,000*l.* rowed over the Thames course between Wallace Ross, of New Brunswick, and William Beach, of Sydney, New South Wales, the holder of the championship. The latter, after a sharp struggle early in the race, shook off his opponent below Hammersmith Bridge and won easily by twelve seconds. Hanlan arrived on the following day from Toronto and challenged the winner, who declined the match.

26. At Castle Island, in County Kerry, a district notorious for its numerous outrages, the police succeeded in arresting five "moonlighters," mostly farmers' sons, who were on the point of setting out on an expedition.

27. At Leipzig a serious encounter took place between the police and the Socialists, who to the number of about 400 were conducting one of their leaders to the railway station.

— H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, having heard that a movement was on foot to present him with a testimonial in recognition of his services in connection with the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, wrote to request that any funds subscribed might be devoted to the furtherance of the Colonial and Indian Institute proposed to be established in celebration of the Queen's Jubilee.

28. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* produced for the first time at the Théâtre Français with a magnificent *mise en scène* and supported by the full force of the company.

— Rev. F. F. Goe, M.A., rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, appointed Bishop of Melbourne, in succession to Dr. Moorhouse, translated to the see of Manchester.

— The steamship *Suffolk*, of London, 2,000 tons register, bound from Batavia to London, struck at 4 p.m. on the rocks off the Lizard during a dense fog. The crew escaped in the boats.

29. Sir Reginald Hanson, the next alderman in rotation, elected Lord Mayor of London for the ensuing year. He had served the office of sheriff on the occasion of the Queen's visit to Epping Forest, and had on that occasion been knighted.

29. Another party riot took place in Belfast among the workmen of Messrs Combe, Barbour, & Co. as they were leaving work. Five policemen only appeared to stop the fight; these were mercilessly stoned by both parties and driven off. Reinforcements were brought up, but without result, and at length the military were sent for, and after several charges the dragoons succeeded in clearing the streets.

30. The Duc d'Aumale allowed the publication of an extract from his will, dated June 3, 1884, in which he bequeathed to the Institut de France, in trust, to preserve in its integrity for the French nation, the domain of Chantilly, with its woods, lawns, waters, and edifices, and all that they contain of trophies, pictures, books, and artistic objects. The principal condition annexed was that the galleries and collections at Chantilly under the name of the Condé Museum should be open to the public.

— During the floods which inundated the Godavery district of the Madras presidency the natives of several villages attempted to cut the bund, in order to free their own district of water at the expense of their neighbours. A serious fight ensued, in the course of which 100 natives were killed.

## OCTOBER.

1. A schooner yacht race, 20 miles out and home, sailed off Newport (U.S.A.), in which the American yacht *Sachem* defeated the English *Miranda* by eight minutes. In a race for sloops, off Marble Head the American *Thetis* was equally successful in defeating the English *Stranger*.

— Father Benson's clergy house at Oxford, the headquarters of the Cowley Fathers, nearly destroyed by fire.

2. The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord R. Churchill) addressed a large meeting at Dartford, and explained the Conservative programme of foreign and domestic policy.

— The last of a series of races between W. E. George, of Worcester, and W. Cummings, of Paisley, was run at Aston Grounds, Birmingham, by which the former became the winner of two out of the three competitions. George started with a slight lead and completed his first mile in 4 min. 45 sec., the second in 9 min. 44 sec., increasing his lead until the fifth mile had been covered in 25 min. 44·5 sec., the fastest time on record. Cummings shortly afterwards broke down and retired, and George, having done eight miles in 41 min. 21·45 sec., was allowed to stop without completing the full distance.

— A serious colliery explosion, involving the loss of twenty-one lives, occurred at the Silkstone Pit at Altofts, near Wakefield.

3. At Sofia, at a great meeting held in support of the Bulgarian Regency, General Kaulbars, the Russian Commissioner, suddenly appeared on the scene and attempted to address the people, but had to desist in consequence of their hostile and menacing demeanour.

4. Mr. Gladstone received at Hawarden deputations representing the corporations of Cork, Limerick, Waterford, and Clonmel, conferring on him the freedom of those boroughs; and one from the women of Ireland.

4. The Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the riots in Belfast and their causes commenced its sittings under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Day, of the English Bench. In consequence of his decision not to allow witnesses to be cross-examined, the members of the Irish bar representing various parties involved left the court.

— Two young ladies, the daughters of a Nationalist farmer living near King Williamstown, were aroused early in the morning by a party of moonlighters, who forced open the door, demanding a gun. On meeting with a refusal the men began to fire, and shot both the ladies, wounding them very severely.

— The "new scheme for the remission of fees" came into operation at the Board schools throughout the London area, and produced great irritation.

— Shocks of earthquake felt at Uist and in other parts of the Shetland Islands.

5. The Very Rev. James Kavanagh, parish priest of Kildare, and formerly president of St. Patrick's College, Carlow, killed at the altar whilst celebrating Mass by the fall of one of the stone ornaments of the canopy.

— A fire broke out in an annexe of the Albert Palace, Battersea, used as a timber shed, but after some difficulty was extinguished without damage to the main building.

— The Church Congress opened at Wakefield, the Archbishop of York preaching the opening sermon and the Bishop of Ripon giving the inaugural address.

— For upwards of a week extraordinary heat prevailed throughout the greater part of England, the thermometer rising to 80° in the shade and in many places exceeding 105° in the sun.

6. A military riot, which at one time threatened to assume the proportions of a mutiny, occurred at Aldershot, where a draft of the Inniskilling Fusiliers were under orders to proceed to South Africa. The provost marshal, however, quickly brought the military police into the streets; and after some fighting, in which many severe casualties occurred, the rioters were overpowered and fifty of them carried off to prison.

7. A serious fight took place between English and French fishermen at Ramsgate, where the latter had come to sell their fish, the English accusing them of having stolen and destroyed their nets on the fishing grounds.

8. The Austrian police allowed to transpire the details of an Anarchist plot to set fire to the city of Vienna on 4th inst. At a fixed hour the city was to be set on fire at several places, the large timber stores in the faubourgs being the centres of each conflagration. On the eve of the day fixed the police, warned by an associate, arrested the principal members of the conspiracy. Quantities of bombs and other explosives, guns, swords, daggers, &c., were seized by the police in different parts of the city, as well as the complete machinery for making counterfeit coins.

— Temple House, Great Marlow, the seat of General Owen Williams, nearly destroyed by a fire which broke out in the newly built west wing. Great damage, amounting in all to 80,000l., was done to the main building and furniture, but the most valuable books were saved.

. In the final heat of the Great International Sculling Handicap at the Sh Harp, Hendon, Geo. Bubear, of Crediton, Devon, defeated J. Ten Eyck, of Worcester, Mass., U.S.A. In the previous heats Wallace Ross (v Brunswick), J. Ten Eyck (U.S.A.), G. Bubear (England), and G. W. Lee (U.S.A.) were the winners. Ten Eyck then defeated Ross, and Bubear defeated Lee.

10. In spite of the efforts and intrigues of the Russian consuls and in spite of the Bulgarian elections passed off without serious disorders, the candidates of the Nationalist party being returned by enormous majorities.

— The *Great Eastern* steamboat had a narrow escape whilst endeavouring to take up her berth in Holyhead Harbour during a heavy gale, in consequence of a difficulty in letting down the anchor, the vessel drifting rapidly onshore on to the rocks, but eventually, when within a few feet, the anchor got down and happily held.

11. "Captain Moonlight," stated to be the leader of the moonlighters of the counties of Cork, Clare, and Limerick, arrested by the police, with two of his gang, at Boherbue.

— A statue erected to the memory of Sister Dora (Miss Dorothy Pattison) unveiled at Walsall, being the first statue to a woman, except those of saints, erected in England. The money (2,000*l.*) had for the most part been subscribed by the working classes, amongst whom Sister Dora had laboured in whose service she had sacrificed her life.

12. At Newmarket the Cesarewitch stakes won by Mr. R. C. Vyner's *Le Clink*, 4 yrs., 7 st. 7 lbs. (W. Glover). 18 started.

— It was announced that 100,000 repeating or magazine rifles, of the Mauser type, had been issued to the German army.

— A number of Mormon elders and missionaries from Utah Territory held a meeting at St. George's Hall, Langham Place, to explain their tenets and to protest against the "persecution" of their body by the United States Government.

13. The Middle Park Plate won easily by Lord Calthorpe's *Florentine* by 10 lengths. 8 started.

— The new hospital at Burnley, the first ever built on the isolated ward system, opened by H.R.H. Prince Albert Victor.

— A cyclone swept over the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, doing serious damage to shipping and buildings at New Orleans, Galveston, and elsewhere. A town on the Sabine Pass was completely swept away, entailing the loss of twenty-five lives.

— An official report on the state of the King of Bavaria's health published, stating that his Majesty was suffering from a mental malady—*monomania*—which the doctors deemed incurable.

14. An alarming fire took place at Killarney House, the seat of the Earl of Kenmare, built some few years previously at the cost of 100,000*l.* The fire originated in the butler's pantry, and, spreading to the adjoining room, was not extinguished until considerable damage had been done.

15. A violent gale, more disastrous in its effects than any which had occurred for many years, broke over England, especially affecting the *western coasts and counties*. The electric railway running along the shore



from Brighton to Kemp Town was swept away; a high wall was blown down at Rochester, killing one and severely maiming another person; and the lighthouse at Perth Castle washed down; the valleys of Glamorganshire, Cardiganshire, &c., were flooded and all traffic stopped. Portsmouth, Plymouth, Swansea, and Cork harbours suffered severely; and along the east coast, at Leith, Dundee, Hartlepool, &c., much damage was done to the shipping, with great loss of life, especially in the English and Irish Channels. In the district of which Birmingham is the centre it rained incessantly for three days, causing destructive floods and great destruction of property. In Aberystwith the ordinary small stream, the Rheidol, suddenly rose to an extraordinary height, wrecking the railway station, overwhelming the gasworks, where the furnace being extinguished the town was plunged in darkness for three nights, whilst the houses in the streets were inundated to a height of four or five feet above the street level.

16. The business portion of the town of Salisbury, Maryland, with property valued at one million dollars, and the greater part of the town of Eastport, Maine, involving a loss of \$800,000, destroyed by fire.

— The second trial of M. Vandersmissen, the Belgian deputy, held at Mons, and concluded with a verdict of guilty with extenuating circumstances. He was sentenced to ten years' penal servitude.

— Shocks of earthquake felt throughout Alsace, the Vosges, and the Black Forest. At Strasburg several shocks were very severe.

17. The casino at Biarritz caught fire in the top story, and, owing to the violence of the gale which was blowing, in a short time the entire building was a mass of flame, and property valued at 80,000*l.* was destroyed.

18. Mansfield College, the first Nonconformist establishment at Oxford, inaugurated in the presence of a large body of Nonconformist clergy and laity.

— After a protracted search the body of Countess Laura von Arnim found at Murz, near Gernsbach, in the Black Forest, whither she had wandered and committed suicide. A large sum of money and valuable jewellery were found upon the body.

— It was stated that Paris millinery houses had received orders to the extent of 15,000*l.* for court and other dresses for the Empress of Japan; and a decree, it was alleged, had appeared in that country making European dress at Court ceremonies obligatory.

19. A thunderstorm of unusual severity broke over the Aldershot district, flooding the camp and destroying the telegraph wires and poles. A number of buildings in the neighbourhood, as well as at Guildford and Aylesbury, were struck by lightning.

20. As Mr. Vandeleur, agent to Mr. S. Oliver in North Kerry, was returning to Tralee from rent-collecting he was fired at four times and his horse wounded. Mr. Vandeleur fired his revolver in return, but without result.

— The Dean of Westminster, having received from the secretaries of three Protestant societies a protest against permitting the Roman Catholic pilgrimage to the shrine of Edward the Confessor at Westminster, replied that he could not interfere with private devotions.

21. The Bank of England advanced its rate of discount from  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 4 per cent., the "reserve" of 10,791,647*l.* representing 40 per cent. of the abilities.

— H.M. despatch boat *Imogene*, attached to the Embassy at Constantinople, went ashore on the rocks off Gallipoli during a fog.

22. Messrs. Baring announced the purchase by a limited liability company of the business of Messrs. Guinness, brewers, of Dublin, for 5,200,000*l.*—partly in shares, and partly in debentures—and invited public subscriptions. In the course of the day the capital required was subscribed several times over, and the debenture stock was quoted at 16 per cent. premium, the preference  $8\frac{1}{4}$ , and the ordinary (10*l.*) shares at  $5\frac{1}{4}$  premium. Before the period for subscribing (three days) had passed upwards of 100,000,000*l.* was offered to the public.

— Earthquake shocks repeated at short intervals felt in various parts of Tennessee, North Carolina, Virginia, and Ohio.

23. Mr. C. E. Lewis (Conservative), whose return for Londonderry by a majority of three over Mr. Justin McCarthy (Home Ruler) had been petitioned against, withdrew his defence and abandoned the seat. Mr. McCarthy's counsel then claimed the seat for his client, and after a short delay the judge allowed the claim.

24. A religious census taken at the doors of the churches and chapels throughout the metropolitan district gave the following results:—

	Approximate Accommodation	Attendance	
		Morning	Evening
Church of England . . .	601,450 . . .	265,277	264,752
Protestant Nonconformist	449,250 . . .	172,523	194,630

The "Monument of Glory" erected in memory of those who had fallen in the Russo-Turkish War, 1876–77, unveiled at St. Petersburg by the zar and Czarina and a large number of the Imperial family. The day was selected as the anniversary of the battle of Gorney-Dubriak.

25. At Périgueux the Grand Séminaire, one of the principal buildings of the town, caught fire, and in less than an hour was totally destroyed. Upwards of three hundred pupils with difficulty escaped half-dressed into the streets.

26. The Cambridgeshire Stakes at Newmarket won by Mr. W. Gilbert's sailor Prince, 6 yrs. 7 st. 7 lbs. (A. White). Sixteen started.

— Lord Randolph Churchill attended the Annual Conference of the National Union of Conservatives at Bradford, and delivered a speech at St. George's Hall.

— A presentation of a testimonial to Mr. Schnadhorst took place at Birmingham, on the occasion of his retirement from the presidency of the Birmingham Liberal Association.

— A block, lasting throughout the night, caused on the Metropolitan Railway by a fire, which broke out in a rag-dealer's warehouse overhanging an open cutting near King's Cross. A large portion of the burning

premises fell down upon the line, and all traffic had to be temporarily suspended.

27. The Socialist procession organised for Lord Mayor's Day proclaimed by the Commissioner of the City Police, after an invitation to the leaders to hold it on some other day.

— Berystede House, near Ascot, the seat of Mr. Henry Standish, totally destroyed by fire ; some of the inmates burned to death.

28. The Spanish Government by decree suddenly transferred to the reserves the entire grade of first sergeants, numbering 1,200 ; they were then attached to fresh regiments, with new grades and additional pay : but their corporate organisation was destroyed.

— A frightful railway collision took place at Portage, Wisconsin, on the Chicago Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railroad, an express train running into a freight train before the latter had had time to run into the siding. Several of the front cars of the passenger train were wrecked, and before the wounded persons could be extricated the *débris* caught fire, and five-and-twenty were burnt to death.

— Bartholdi's colossal statue of Liberty, presented by France to America, and destined to be used as a lighthouse at the entrance of the harbour at New York, inaugurated by President Cleveland, attended by the United States Ministry and a vast concourse of spectators. The statue, of bronze, measures 151 ft. in height, and is placed on a pedestal 154 ft. high—rises 805 ft. out of the water—together forming the highest figure monument in the world.

— In the Court of Queen's Bench the Lord Chief Justice (Lord Coleridge), Mr. Justice Manisty, and Mr. Justice Stephen decided that to insure the effective control of dogs required by the recent police regulations they must be either muzzled or led.

29. Three Atlantic steamers stranded in the course of twenty-four hours : the *Persian Monarch*, 8,928 tons, on the Portland Breakwater, whilst standing in for a Channel pilot ; the Cunard steamer *Pavonia*, on the High Pine Ledge, Massachusetts Bay, 20 miles south of Boston ; and the Beaver line steamer *Lake Huron*, on Madame Island, 7 miles below Quebec. In each case the disaster was attributable to fog.

— Very serious floods prevailed in the departments of Vaucluse, Bouches-du-Rhône, &c., in the south of France. At Château Renard a baker's house, which was surrounded by water, was struck by a flash of lightning, and its five inmates killed instantaneously.

80. The officer commanding at Aden received orders to occupy and annex to the British possessions the island of Socotra, a mountainous island about 140 miles east of Cape Guardafui, near the line of route between Bombay and Aden, and commanding the Gulf of Aden.

— The Gravel Pit Wood, extending over about seventy acres in the north of London, between Highgate and Muswell Hill, "dedicated" by the Lord Mayor to the public use. The land, which was the property of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, was given in charge to the City Corporation, it being outside the area of the Metropolitan Board of Works.

80. The triennial election of a Lord Rector of the Edinburgh University resulted in the return of the Earl of Iddeleigh by 1,094 votes, against 747 led by Sir Lyon Playfair.

— Dr. H. Montagu Butler, Dean of Gloucester, late head master of Eton, appointed Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, in the place of Dr. Simpson, deceased.

81. A great demonstration of 80,000 workmen made at Charleroi, Belgium, to demand the extension of the suffrage and an amnesty for those condemned for the riots of March.

## NOVEMBER.

1. The results of the municipal elections throughout England showed a slight gain to the Conservatives; but in many instances politics had no influence on the choice of the Town Councillors.

— The contest for the mayoralty of New York resulted in the return of Wm. A. Hewitt (Democrat) by 90,296 votes, his competitors, Mr. Henry George (Socialist), receiving 67,699; and Mr. Roosevelt (Republican), 60,892 votes.

2. A serious explosion of gas took place at 41 Portland Place, the town residence of the Earl of Lathom. All the windows in the front of the house from basement to roof were burst outwards, and much damage was done to the internal fittings, pictures, &c.

— Colonel Fraser, as chief of the City of London Police, issued a notice proclaiming the Socialist procession announced for Lord Mayor's Day, and stating that no other procession but that of the Lord Mayor would be allowed on that day within the City precincts.

3. The Ninth Annual Conference of the National Federation opened this year at Leeds, under the presidency of Sir J. Kitson. The principal speakers were Mr. John Morley, Sir Wm. Harcourt, and Mr. Fowler.

— At a meeting of the Académie des Sciences M. Pasteur stated that up to October 31 he had inoculated for hydrophobia 2,490 persons, of whom 26 were French. Ten of the French patients had died, six being children.

4. The Social Democrats announced their intention to abandon their proposed procession to follow that of the Lord Mayor, and to substitute for it a grand demonstration in Trafalgar Square for the same day.

— The Prince of Wales requested a number of noblemen and gentlemen to assist in framing the scheme upon which the proposed Colonial and Indian Museum should be founded.

— Bourgas, a port on the Black Sea, in Eastern Roumelia, seized by a party of Montenegrins, under the leadership of the Russian captain Nabokoff, was speedily recovered by the forces despatched by the regency at Tirnova.

5. A fire broke out in Cliff Street, Ramsgate, and was undiscovered until the whole building was ablaze. Four of the occupants lost their lives in attempting to escape.

5. In a billiard match between Peall and Collins the former made the extraordinary break of 2,418 points.

— Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., had an interview with the Sultan, which lasted for upwards of an hour.

6. The 250th anniversary fête of the foundation of Harvard University celebrated with great rejoicings, at which representatives from Oxford, Cambridge, and other universities were present and received degrees of honour. In 1636 (Oct. 28, O.S.) the colony of Massachusetts Bay voted 400*l.* for the establishment of a school at Newtown; and two years later the college took its present name, in consequence of a bequest (his library and 800*l.*) from the Rev. John Harvard, a graduate of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and subsequently a Presbyterian minister.

7. A serious fire broke out at the Richmond public baths, belonging to the vestry, the greater portion being destroyed.

— L. M. Donovan, who had previously jumped off Brooklyn Bridge, at New York, for a wager, leaped from the Niagara Suspension Bridge, below the fall, a drop of 190 feet. He was picked up by a row-boat, and found to have ruptured the pleura and displaced a rib.

8. The closing of the Liverpool Maritime Exhibition, which had been visited by upwards of two millions of visitors, was marked by a disgraceful riot, in the course of which the police, in attempting to clear the building, were severely handled.

9. The Lord Mayor's procession, which had been threatened to be disturbed by a Socialist demonstration, passed off quietly; but a very large display of police and soldiers was made along the route. In spite, too, of all precautions, the Socialists held a meeting in Trafalgar Square, some few of whom afterwards marched to Hyde Park. Along the line of route, and in many parts of the West End, the shops were either closed or barricaded.

— The *London Gazette* contained a Royal proclamation, establishing a distinguished service order for officers of the army and navy.

10. Prince Waldemar of Denmark elected Prince of Bulgaria by the Great Sobranje assembled at Tirnova; but the offer, having been referred to his father, the King of Denmark, was declined under the circumstances of the situation.

— The Colonial and Indian Exhibition closed without ceremony. Since its opening, on May 4, 5,550,749 persons had passed through the turnstiles. An interim report of the Finance Committee, published almost immediately, stated that the balance-sheet showed the total receipts of the exhibition to have been 208,490*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.*, and expenditure 218,927*l.* 12*s.* The balance-sheet of the Health Exhibition (1884), also published at the same time, showed receipts, 285,580*l.* 11*s.*; expenditure, over 220,000*l.* The Fisheries Exhibition (1883) showed receipts, 162,903*l.* 7*s.* 10*d.*; expenditure, 148,151*l.* 0*s.* 3*d.*

11. Vice-Chancellor Bacon, "the last of the Vice-Chancellors," resigned his seat on the Bench, having already entered his eighty-eighth year. The majority of the judges attended his court to assist at the farewell, spoken in



name of the Bar by the Attorney-General. The vacancy on the Bench was at once filled by the promotion of Mr. Arthur Kekewich, Q.C.

11. An alarming fire broke out at the Birmingham Corporation Gas Works, Saltley, involving the destruction of many thousands of tons of coke, and at one time threatening to cause the explosion of the gasometer, one of the largest in the kingdom.

— A “gorsedd,” or solemn meeting of the Welsh Druids, to “proclaim” the forthcoming Eisteddfod, was held in the Temple Gardens. The Archdruid, standing in the centre of twelve bards, went through the preliminary ceremony to be observed in the city chosen for the scene of the national gathering.

12. Mr. Phelps, the American Minister, delivered the inaugural address of the Edinburgh Philosophical Society on the subject of “The Law of the Future.”

— Fred Archer, the jockey, buried at Newmarket, and followed to his grave by a number of friends from all parts of the kingdom.

— Mr. Matthew Arnold presented with a testimonial from the schoolmasters of the Westminster district on his retirement, after 35 years' service, in the Inspectorship of Schools.

— As a train was travelling at full speed towards Sisteron (Basses Alpes) a large mass of the mountain, at the foot of which the railway runs, was detached, and struck the train, completely burying two carriages and causing the death of nine persons.

13. The Colston Banquets took place at Bristol; Sir M. Hicks-Beach being the chief speaker at the Dolphin (Conservative) Society, and Lord Herschell at the Anchor (Liberal) Society.

— Great damage done to the nets of the Lowestoft fishermen by Belgian drift-nets.

— The Prince of Mingrelia, an officer in the Russian army, and a son-in-law of Count Adlersberg, Minister of State, announced as the Russian candidate for the throne of Bulgaria.

14. The expedition to the island of Skye to enforce the sheriff's decrees arrested John Macpherson, “the Glendale Martyr,” and the Rev. Donald MacCallum, minister at Walernish, on a charge of inciting to violence.

15. The village of Frimstein, in the canton Berne, almost totally destroyed by fire, and many lives lost.

— The cattle disease, known as “anthrax,” declared itself on two farms in Kent—one at Sturry and the other at Ditton, near Maidstone.

— Deputations of the London Trades' Council and London Workingmen's Association visited Sandringham to present addresses and votes of thanks to the Prince of Wales for having initiated and successfully directed the scheme for the admittance of working-men to the Colonial and Indian Exhibition.

— The town of Makow, in Russian Poland, containing upwards of 7,000 inhabitants, mostly Jews, took fire, and continued burning for more than twenty-eight hours.

16. Mr. Justice Butt pronounced the marriage between Mr. A. E. Sebright and Miss Lena Scott to be null and void on the ground of fraud and duress.

— The head-mastership of Rugby School, vacant by the resignation of Dr. Jex Blake, offered to Dr. Percival, President of Trinity College, Oxford and accepted by him.

17. Mr. Arthur Balfour, Secretary for Scotland, added to the Cabinet.

18. In reply to a deputation from the Metropolitan Board of Works, the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Lord R. Churchill) declined to promise the support of the Government to a Bill for prolonging for a further period the coal and wine dues, payable within the Metropolitan district.

— Near Pittsburg, on the Cincinnati and St. Louis Railroad, a train, passing at the moment of a landslip, was struck by the mass of earth and rock; three sleeping cars were wrecked, and eight of the occupants seriously injured.

— Mr. Thomas Stevens reached Shanghai, after having performed a journey of nearly 12,000 miles on a bicycle. He started from San Francisco in April 1884, and covered the following distances: In America, 8,700; across Europe, 2,500, to Teheran, 1,600, to Meshed, 600, through Berjanda and Furrah to Herat and back to Meshed, 1,000; Meshed to Astrabad, 400; Lahore to Calcutta, 1,600; and in China, where after a few days he had, on account of the hostility of the natives, to abandon his bicycle, 800 miles: total, 11,700 miles.

19. A serious fire, due to the explosion of a mineral oil lamp, broke out in the private apartments at Hampton Court Palace, on the side towards the Tennis Court. In spite of every effort, the flames were not subdued for some hours. None of the public rooms or their contents were injured; but about thirty of the private apartments were completely gutted, and the damage done to the buildings was estimated at little less than 20,000*l*.

— Sir Robt. G. C. Hamilton, Under-Secretary for Ireland, appointed Governor of Tasmania.

— General Kaulbars, the Russian agent, recalled from Roumania. He left Sofia without demonstration, and was followed by the other Russian agents and consuls throughout the country. The protection of Russian subjects in Bulgaria was committed to the French Consul-General, after having been offered to Germany.

21. A demonstration, organised by the Social Democrats, held in Trafalgar Square, and attended by a large crowd, composed of ordinary sightseers and roughs, variously estimated at from 30,000 to 50,000. The Socialist processions were perfectly organised, leaving the square at the appointed hour, passing their resolutions quietly from four platforms, and peaceably dispersing. A very large force of police constables was present in Trafalgar Square and the neighbouring streets, and order was not disturbed.

22. A shocking trial for murder took place at Blois, in which two men and one woman were accused of having burned to death an old woman, aged 70, the mother of the men and the mother-in-law of the woman. The plea set up

in their defence was that the old woman was looked upon as a witch who had cast a spell on the house. The woman and one man were found guilty and condemned to death.

23. A son born at Windsor to the Princess Henry of Battenberg (Princess Beatrice).

24. For three days a fog of great denseness hung over the southern and western parts of London and for many miles over the Surrey suburbs. The fog gradually invaded the whole city, where for the greater part of the third day business was seriously impeded.

— At the Miners' Conference at Manchester a resolution was adopted that seven hours constituted a sufficiently long working day, and delegates were instructed to take the sense of their districts on this point.

— In opening the Session of the German Reichstag, the Royal Speech expressed the intention of the Ministry to increase the army by 40,000, thus anticipating the septennial revision of the conscription by one year.

25. After eight days' trial before Mr. Justice Denman and a special jury, the case of *Adams v. Lord Coleridge* and *Hon. B. Coleridge* for libel terminated in a verdict for the defendants.

— The election of the Lord Rector of Aberdeen University was decided in favour of Mr. Arthur J. Balfour (Secretary for Scotland) by 108 votes against Sir John Lubbock, who polled 88 votes.

— Great excitement and opposition displayed at Liverpool and other northern towns in consequence of the refusal of the Postmaster-General to prolong the exclusive contract for carrying the American mails with the White Star and Cunard lines, and to admit the North German Lloyd ships (touching at Southampton) to participation in the subsidy.

26. Staple Inn, Holborn, one of the remnants of "Old London," and comprising the old historic hall, chambers, and gardens (superficial area, 88,864 sq. ft.), sold by auction by the "Ancients" of the Inn to the Prudential Assurance Company for 68,000*l*.

— The Irish Executive proclaimed the intended anti-rent meetings of the National League in the county Sligo, and served notices on Mr. Dillon, Mr. O'Brien, &c., to find sureties for their good behaviour.

27. The Belgian mail train robbed between Ostend and Ghent of upwards of 140 registered letters, containing diamonds and other property, valued at 40,000*l*. The bags were part of a sealed mail from the United States to Russia. The thieves are supposed to have travelled to Brussels, where they quitted the train at the Station du Nord, drove to the Station du Midi, and returned by way of Calais to London, which they must have reached almost as soon as the robbery was discovered.

— A statue of Cobden unveiled at Stockport by one of his daughters, the principal speaker being the Marquess of Ripon.

28. Mr. Wm. O'Brien, editor of *United Ireland*, and Mr. O'Kelly, M.P., in spite of the prohibition of the anti-rent meetings, succeeded in evading the police at Sligo, and in holding a series of local meetings in various parts of the county—*hastily convened* and lasting a very short time,

28. At the Sligo Town Hall a meeting was broken up by the police, after a protest from the Mayor, who was presiding.

29. It was announced that General Sir Redvers Buller would, at the beginning of the New Year, succeed Sir Robt. Hamilton as Under-Secretary for Ireland.

— Dr. Tindal Robertson (Conservative) returned unopposed for Brighton, Sir G. O. Trevelyan having declined to contest the seat as the representative of the two sections of the Liberal party.

— Dr. Williams, of Chicago, elected to be Treasurer of the Revolutionary Directory of the Fenian Brotherhood, in the place of O'Donovan Rossa, who was excommunicated, having been found guilty of "fraud, treachery, treason, persistent violation of the constitution in financial matters, and gross indiscretion."

30. The church of St. Bartholomew, Smithfield, founded in 1102—one of the most interesting historical records of the City of London—reopened, after having been completely restored, and, so far as possible, with regard to the original designs.

— At the annual meeting of the Royal Society the gold medals of the year were distributed after the delivery of an address by the President, Dr. Stokes. The Copley medal was awarded to Professor Franz E. Neumann, for his researches in optics and electro-dynamics; the Rumford medal to Professor Langley, of the United States, for his invention of and experiments with the "bolometer"; the Davy medal to M. de Marignac, for his researches on atomic weights; and the two Royal medals to Professor Tait, as a distinguished mathematician, and Mr. Francis Galton, in recognition of his labours as a biological statistician.

## DECEMBER.

1. At a fire in a dwelling-house in Battersea a woman, sleeping on the ground-floor, and a boy, aged six, were burnt to death. Almost at the same time two men were burnt to death at a fire in Islington; and at a third fire two people, jumping from a window to escape, were seriously injured.

— At a private meeting of the Nationalist members of the Dublin Corporation it was resolved to submit the names of Messrs. Sexton, Dillon, and O'Brien for selection as sheriffs of Dublin for the ensuing year.

— At Cork a demonstration in honour of Mr. Timothy Hurley, who had been committed for trial for having in his possession two parcels of dynamite, was the occasion of a riot in the streets, in which Mr. John O'Connor, M.P., and Dr. Tanner, M.P., took part, and the latter was struck down by the police whilst attempting to rescue his colleague.

2. A destructive fire broke out in the warehouse of Messrs. Thompson, wholesale stationers, Knightrider Street, Doctors' Commons, and spread rapidly to the adjoining premises in Old Change. The church of St. Mary Magdalen and St. Gregory by St. Paul's also caught fire, and was completely destroyed, with its fine organ and carved woodwork, the massive outer walls and stone tower alone remaining intact. The damage done was valued at upwards of 100,000*l.*

2. A terrible explosion occurred at Elmore Colliery, Hetton, near Durham. Happily, there were only thirty-eight men in the pit at the time ; but of twenty were more or less burnt, of whom all died, and of the remaining sixteen entombed by a fall of the coal only one could be extricated alive.

— The Chelmsford Workhouse, including a large block of buildings, burned down, and all the pauper inmates suddenly thrown out into the cold town where no immediate provision could be made for their reception.

3. M. Popp, the inventor of pneumatic clocks, acquitted by the Tribunal de la Seine of the charge of obtaining money under false pretences, brought against him by a number of persons who had advanced him money to carry out a system of the extraction of gold from millstones. M. Popp had stated that from 3,000 to 4,000 francs' worth of gold was to be extracted from each ton of stone, and several capitalists found the necessary funds. Disgusted at the want of success attending their expenditure, they took steps against the pretended discoverer.

— The Glasgow Blind Asylum took fire, and it was with the greatest difficulty that the inmates, about 300, could be conducted in safety out of the burning building. Happily, all were rescued, but two of the wings of the asylum were completely destroyed.

4. The Editor of *Punch* committed for trial for libel in publishing an article, "Sketches from Mr. *Punch's* Studio. To Mrs. Gore-Jenkins, a suburban political lady," Mrs. R. Gent-Davis, the wife of the member for Birmingham, considered the article as personal to herself.

— Conferences held at St. Stephen's Hall in connection with the Potato Centenary, intended to commemorate the introduction of potatoes into England, and devise means for improving the crop and removing restrictions on its cultivation and distribution.

— M. de Freycinet, in consequence of an adverse vote on the maintenance of sous-préfets throughout France, resigned office with the rest of the cabinet.

— The Cunard steamer *Umbria* declined to take three bags of "ships' papers," despatched by the Post Office, and specially addressed, refusing, however, to allow the Post Office mail tender to come alongside.

5. The result of a poll of the Hornsey ratepayers on the question of the purchase of Churchyard Bottom Wood, Highgate, from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, showed 1,822 in favour ; against, 2,762.

— The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Hon. E. Stanhope) addressed a regular despatch to the Colonial Governments, requesting them to send delegates to London to discuss the means by which the bonds uniting the various portions of the Empire could be drawn closer.

7. Great Conference of Liberal Unionists held at Willis's Rooms, followed by a banquet at the Hotel Métropole, under the presidency of the Marquess of Hartington.

— At Lurgan the acquittal of a mason named Hart, charged with murder at the riots of the previous autumn, led to further rioting. A daylight procession, accompanied by bands, marched through the town, kindling the passions of both parties. The police having proved unable to



protect the property of peaceable citizens, troops and reinforcements of constables were telegraphed for, and after some hours the streets were finally cleared by the dragoons.

7. A severe gale, accompanied by snow, hail, and thunder, raged over the greater part of the United Kingdom, and especially over the southern and western coasts. St. Andrew's Church, Lambeth, was struck by lightning, and a portion of a large stone cross fell. The gale lasted for the greater part of three days, doing enormous damage to shipping and to buildings on the coast.

8. On the west coast the gale of the previous day increased to a hurricane, the barometer falling to  $28^{\circ}45$ ; a lower reading than had been recorded for forty years. The coast from Ilfracombe to the Solway Firth, as well as far up the Bristol Channel, was strewn with wrecks. The traffic on the Cambrian Railway was seriously interrupted; the mail train from Aberystwith, being unable to make way against the wind, had to turn back. Telegraphic communication with America and the Continent was almost completely interrupted, the wires being broken on the coasts. At Formby, on the north coast of Lancashire, three lifeboats put off to the assistance of the German barque *Mexico*; and although the crew were rescued, with the utmost difficulty, by the Lytham lifeboat, the Southport and Blackpool lifeboats, which started out with the same object, were both capsized, and twenty-six lives were lost—thirteen out of sixteen from each crew.

9. M. Goblet, who had been Minister of Public Instruction in M. de Freycinet's Cabinet, succeeded in constructing a new administration, largely composed of members of the outgoing Cabinet.

— The panel from which the jury were to be selected to try the persons charged with resistance to the law at Woodford declared by the judges to have been irregularly framed, and the trials ordered to be postponed.

10. The petition presented against the return by one vote of Mr. M'Arthur (Liberal) for the Buckrose division of Yorkshire closed after four days' scrutiny of the votes, and resulted in the award of the seat to Mr. C. Sykes (Conservative) by a majority of 11 votes.

— Lord Dufferin reached Pondicherry, and received with great honour by the French officials, he being the first English Viceroy who had ever visited the French settlement.

11. A violent shock of earthquake occurred at Smyrna, and was felt severely at Chios.

— A fight for the championship and 400*l.* between Smith and Knifton was cleverly prevented by the police, who captured the principals, thirteen of their friends and backers, and all the poles, ropes, &c., in a van at Shadwell. The arrangements for the fight had been defeated on two previous occasions—once in France, and once on the borders of Surrey and Sussex.

12. A serious fire occurred at Queen's College, Oxford, by which the rooms of the Senior Bursar and one of the professors were almost destroyed, and those of the Provost damaged.

13. The United States Government expressed its consent, in a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to Mr. Marquand, to forego the 80 per

import duty hitherto charged on old pictures as "works of art," and the year 1700 as the dividing line between such works and "antiquities," and would be admitted duty free.

4. Sir John Pope Hennessy, Governor of Mauritius, suspended from his functions by the Royal Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson, on the ground that his policy had occasioned a breach between classes and nationalities on the island.

5. In the High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh, six Skye crofters condemned for mobbing and rioting in Skye and resisting the sheriff's authority to three months' imprisonment each.

- The Court of Queen's Bench in Ireland pronounced judgment in the case of Mr. Dillon, M.P., and decided that he should enter into securities and two sureties of 1,000*l.* each for his good behaviour, or go to prison for six months; and Mr. Justice O'Brien pronounced the "Plan of Campaign" to be an absolutely illegal organisation.

- At a fire which occurred in the shop of a general dealer at Sutton, Surrey, a woman and her three children were burned to death, and a fourth seriously injured as to be removed to the hospital.

- The Crown of Bulgaria informally offered to Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg by the Bulgarian Delegates at Vienna.

6. The new Sion College, erected on the Thames Embankment, from designs by Mr. A. Blomfield, opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales.

- A great panic in the railway market of the New York Stock Exchange, some of the leading stocks losing 10 per cent.

- Merlatti completed his fifty days' fast, undertaken under strict supervision at the Grand Hotel, at Paris. Although dreadfully emaciated, feverish, and weak, he was able to sustain to the last.

- A Mississippi steamer, the *Tom White*, destroyed by fire whilst loaded with cotton off Bayou Sara, Louisiana, and thirty persons burnt to death.

7. Messrs. Dillon, M.P., O'Brien, editor of *United Ireland*, Harris, M.P., and Sheehy, M.P., arrested at Loughrea, where they had opened an office to receive rents of Lord Clanricarde's estate, in conformity with the "Plan of Campaign." The police carried off the money, books, and accounts found on the premises.

- In consequence of the state of affairs in New York, the Bank of England raised its rate of discount to 5 per cent., although the total reserve was at 11,644,000*l.*, or 48½ per cent. of the liabilities.

8. The Reichstag Committee on the German Army Bill introduced so many objectionable amendments and restrictions that General von Schellén, the Minister for War, declared it to be quite unacceptable and unsuitable to the purposes of the Government.

- According to the French papers, Vicomte Oscar Rivoré de Coligny, a descendant of Admiral de Coligny, appointed station master at Lyons. Through Admiral de Coligny's daughter, who married William of Orange, Vicomte Oscar would be related to both the King of Holland and the Emperor of Germany.

18. The infant son of the Princess Beatrice and Prince Henry of Battenberg baptised at Windsor, in the presence of the Queen and the Royal family.

— The Irish "Plan of Campaign" proclaimed in the *Dublin Gazette* to be an unlawful and criminal conspiracy, and summonses served upon seven members of Parliament to appear in answer to the charge of conspiracy.

— The whole body of bailiffs and process servers employed in King's County refused to serve any more writs.

20. In the cross petitions for divorce filed by Lord and Lady Colin Campbell, extending over nineteen days, the jury, after three hours' deliberation, returned into court at 10 p.m. and found that on neither side were the charges proved, and Mr. Justice Butt dismissed both petitions. The costs were estimated at between 15,000*l.* and 20,000*l.*

— A meeting held at the Mansion House in aid of the funds of Guy's Hospital, the income of which, owing to agricultural depression, had fallen from 44,000*l.* to 26,000*l.*

21. Field Marshal Lord Napier of Magdala, C.B., appointed Constable of the Tower, in the place of Sir R. J. Dacres, K.C.B., deceased.

— At the weekly meeting of the Metropolitan Board of Works the budget for the ensuing year was presented, showing an estimated income of 1,716,758*l.*, to which the consolidated rate contributed 964,279*l.*, and the coal and wine dues 325,000*l.*, whilst the expenditure was principally made up of interest on loans, 931,545*l.*, and redemption of capital, 896,811*l.* The amount of the rate required from the metropolitan parishes would be 7·09*d.*, as compared with 6·88*d.* of the previous year.

22. Telegrams from Germany, Austria, and France announced heavy snowstorms; railway traffic was almost completely suspended between Berlin and several parts of the Empire. A sledge postal service established between Leipzig and Dresden. In every place the troops were employed in removing the snow.

23. Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation as Chancellor of the Exchequer announced.

— The polling in the Brentford division of Middlesex resulted in the return of Mr. J. Bigwood (Conservative) by 2,572 votes over Mr. J. Haysman (Gladstonian), who received 1,816 votes.

24. The British ironclad *Sultan* having parted her lower cables drifted into collision with the *Ville de Victoria*, in Lisbon harbour; and being unable to make head against the tide her spur came in contact with the steamer and caused her to sink almost instantly, involving the loss of thirty lives. The *Minotaur* also dragged her anchors and fouled the *Monarch*.

— A large general shop and establishment, with a menagerie attached, at Liverpool, known as Lewis's, seven storeys high, and covering a large area, discovered to be on fire, and before long was a mass of flames, on which the engines had no power. The damage done was estimated at over a quarter of a million, and upwards of 1,000 hands were thrown out of employment. A white polar bear was one of the few animals kept alive, the firemen never ceasing to play on him with the hose.

25. The landlord of an inn at Clapham, whose premises had been invaded by a noisy but friendly body of carol singers, having failed to induce them to withdraw, fired from his bedroom window a pistol, which wounded fatally one of the singers.

26. In the course of the afternoon a heavy snowstorm, accompanied by a high wind, set in and lasted for many hours, especially in London and in the south of England generally. The damage done to telegraph wires and cables, railways, public buildings, trees, &c., was incalculable, the weight of the snow carrying away nearly all the overhead wires and snapping the cables in all directions. Of five hundred wires connecting London with the outside world only two wires were left in a working state.

27. The treaty of 1841, between England and Prussia, respecting a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem annulled by mutual agreement.

— The Temple Theatre at Philadelphia, one of the finest in the city, burnt down during a rehearsal. No lives were lost, but damage done to the value of \$800,000.

28. The newspapers remained altogether deprived of telegraphic and rail news, a general interruption, except on one of the American cables, being announced by the Post Office. Communication in the north of England and Scotland was not interfered with.

— The whole of the 1,500 prisoners confined in the Gaillon prison, near Rouen, who had revolted two days previously, capitulated (after having held the whole of the interior of the building for more than eight-and-forty hours). The troops at first contented themselves with surrounding the prison, so as to prevent any escape; and the convicts threatened to burn it down unless they were allowed a free passage. On the arrival of fresh troops, however, they surrendered. The alleged causes of the revolt were insufficiency and bad quality of food, arbitrary conduct of the gaolers, and night surveillance.

30. Mr. Dillon, M.P., attended the Judges' Chambers and gave the required bail (1,000*l.*) for his good behaviour.

— Lord Hartington having consulted with his colleagues decided to decline Lord Salisbury's offer to take part in a Coalition Ministry.

— At the Houghton Main Colliery, near Durham, ten men were killed by the breaking of the rope by which the cage was being lowered. The fall was at least 500 yards, the cage being but fifty yards from the surface when the rope gave way.

31. The negotiations between Lord Salisbury and Lord Hartington resulted in the decision of the latter not to enter the Cabinet at that time; whereupon a similar offer was made to Mr. Goschen.

— A fire occurred at the annual fair held in the People's Park at Madras. A large crowd of natives was assembled in a reserved space when the alarm was raised, and in the struggle which ensued nearly three hundred lives were lost.

# RETROSPECT

## OF

### LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART IN 1886.

#### LITERATURE.

ONCE again the subjects of history and biography comprise the largest and most important part of the literature of the year. The number of readable books of travel seems annually to increase. Poetry is less strongly represented than it was last year; while the permanent contributions made to the study of theology and science appear to have been comparatively few.

One of the most interesting historical works of the year is Mr. Lilly's **Chapters in European History** (Chapman & Hall). Mr. Lilly is one of the philosophical historians who bid fair to establish a new method of historical teaching. He prefaces his essays by an introductory dialogue entitled "What can History teach us?" which leads to the conclusion that the history of mankind is after all a history of progress. The first chapter is devoted to the discussion of "the Christian revolution," and from that Mr. Lilly passes on to deal with some of the ideas of the Middle Ages, especially with the far-reaching policy of Hildebrand, which made the Church independent of the greatest temporal potentates, and with the spiritualism which found its simplest and purest expression in mediæval Latin songs. But with the close of the Middle Ages Mr. Lilly's sympathies appear to end. To his mind the Renaissance is only remarkable for the destruction of liberty in politics, for the rise of a spurious classicism in literature and art, and for the origin of the crude sensationalism of a later school of philosophy. The evil influences of the Renaissance are traced and developed in the subsequent chapters upon "the eighteenth century" and "the principles of 1789," in the degradation of the French clergy, and the charlatanism of Rousseau; and a concluding chapter is devoted to the work and the times of Balzac, whom Mr. Lilly regards as representing in his ideas and his genius the spirit of the age in which he lived. We may well differ from the theories laid down in these volumes, but we shall all welcome the manner in which they are laid before us.

Two modern historians have brought out fresh instalments of their works. By the production of his fourth and fifth volumes, Mr. Spencer Walpole brings to a close his **History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815** (Longmans). The first of these two volumes deals with the reformed House of Commons, with the philanthropic efforts of Lord Ashley and Robert Owen, with the agitations of the Chartists and the Corn-Law Repealers, and with the O'Connell movement in Ireland. Thence the author passes to discuss the great ecclesiastic movements of the period, the



ctarian revival and the Scottish disruption controversy, and then proceeds deal with foreign affairs, and to criticise the policy of Lord Aberdeen and Lord Palmerston. The fifth volume opens with a narrative of domestic history down to the year 1853, and this is followed by a not very important chapter on the Crimean war. The three chapters devoted to India, though bearing no proportion to the rest of the work, are complete and valuable, and so is the account of Australia given in the chapter upon the colonies; on the other hand, the development of Canada receives very scanty attention, and so Walpole's work, on the whole, can scarcely, perhaps, be said to take rank as a standard authority. The second volume of Mr. Fyffe's **History of Modern Europe** (Cassell) is in its first chapters fully up to the level of the other one. These chapters are accurate and readable, and give a lucid and concise epitome of the events of the years which followed Waterloo, while Europe was endeavouring to recover from the troubles of the Napoleonic wars. They are the history of the period of reaction. To the affairs of peace, especially between 1820 and 1830, Mr. Fyffe is more liberal of space than in a true sense of proportion warrants, and he does full justice to the statesmanship of Castlereagh and Canning. But in the last three chapters of this volume, which deal with the European movements which occurred during the reign of Louis Philippe, and which bring the narrative down to the year 1848, there is a marked tendency to sacrifice to brevity all other considerations, which somewhat detracts from the value of a useful and resting book.

Mr. Symonds has supplemented his history of the Renaissance by two volumes on the subject of **The Catholic Revival** (Smith & Elder), the first of which is chiefly occupied with history, and the second with biography and criticism. One chapter is devoted to a study of the Inquisition and its effect on literature, another to the Jesuits and their effect upon morality. Two chapters are given to Tasso, one to Giordano Bruno, one to Sarpi, and more than one chapter abounds in stories illustrative of the morals of the period. Indeed, it is chiefly with the social, moral, and literary aspects of the period that Mr. Symonds is concerned, rather than with the reform of the Catholic Church, and the militant policy of the revived Papacy, which are finally the subject-matter of his work. On the whole it is a melancholy and degraded period, which certainly requires a chronicler, and which has found in Mr. Symonds at least a sympathetic historian, who has presently the gift of style.

Historians have come forward to chronicle and elucidate the early life of some of the best loved and most hated of British sovereigns. The object of Mr. Stevenson, who has extracted chiefly from original documents an interesting account of the early years of **Mary Stuart** (Paterson), has been to show that there is no truth in the theory which traces to Mary's education and training in France the perverted notions of right and wrong which her contemporaries attribute to her. The book is avowedly written with the view of contributing to Queen Mary's vindication. It begins with a brief sketch of the policy of Henry VIII. towards Scotland, and of the relations between Scotland and England during Mary's sojourn in France. Thence the author goes on to describe the young queen's early training, and he effectually disposes of the view that Catherine de Medici had a large share in her daughter-in-law's education. It was the Guises who were responsible for Mary's bringing up, and the queen-mother of France was the rival and the enemy, rather than the patroness, of the young Scottish queen. The duty

which Father Stevenson has performed to the memory of Queen Mary, Mr. Beresford Chancellor has undertaken to discharge towards the grandson who inherited her name and her misfortunes. **The Life of Charles I.** (Bell) which he has written is designed to fill a space which other historians have rather unaccountably left vacant, and to supply a narrative of Charles's early years down to the date of his accession to the throne. Mr. Chancellor has "simply detailed the principal facts of Charles's life from 1600 to 1625," in a style which is attractive and often amusing, from the days when as a child the prince gradually overcame his bodily weakness, until the days when his hazardous expedition to Madrid, and the consequences which resulted from it, nearly entailed upon his country the danger of a great European war. Mr. Chancellor has studied a great number of authorities, and has spared no pains in the preparation of his book.

Four more volumes, numbering from the fifth to the eight, have been added to Mr. Leslie Stephen's **Dictionary of National Biography** (Smith & Elder). The first two of these new volumes, owing of course to their subject-matter, happen to be less attractive than the last two. There are a large number of good lives of people of secondary interest, such as Miss Clerke's sketch of Robert Boyle, Mr. Lee's account of the regicide Bradshaw, Professor Creighton's biography of Boniface of Savoy, and other articles on Falkes de Breauté, Sir John Bowring, and Bishop Bonner. The last-mentioned article is by Mr. James Gairdner, and is consequently of real historical value. It goes far to vindicate the bishop's character against the popular judgment which attributes to him the first place among the most cruel and unworthy bigots of his age. At least Bonner had conscientious opinions, for which he could sacrifice position and fame. Mr. Knight's account of Mrs. Bracegirdle is only one among a number of attractive sketches of heroes and heroines of the drama. But the chief interest of the volumes lies in the few biographies of really celebrated personages which they contain, in the articles on Blake and Brougham, on Boswell and the Brontës. In his life of the great Puritan sailor Professor Laughton has had a clear field, but he has been obliged to destroy a great many of the best-known traditions which have gathered round Blake's name, for which it is difficult, but just, to thank him. Mr. Hunt's biography of Lord Brougham is an admirable but by no means partial piece of work; and the editor's articles on Boswell and the Brontës—the latter of whom he has grouped together and dealt with in a single paper—are perhaps the next attractive in these first two volumes. There is, however, no lack of interesting subjects in the two latter volumes which have appeared. They are full of great names. Mr. Leslie Stephen has reserved to himself the task of dealing with Burns, with Byron, with Bishop Butler, with Buckle, and with the political economist Cairnes. It is needless to say that these articles could not be in better hands. In his criticism of Buckle, the "brilliant amateur," Mr. Stephen is at his best; but he has had a harder task in the long essay which is devoted to Lord Byron. Among the longest articles in these two volumes is Mr. Hunt's biography of Burke, which is fair-minded and careful, if not brilliant; and equally impartial treatment has been vouchsafed to the Cannings, especially to the great Tory leader and the first Indian Viceroy. Mr. Lane-Poole contributes a specially interesting sketch of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe; Mr. J. A. Hamilton, a somewhat severe portrait of the late Lord Cairns; and essays on the Bruces and the Campbells, on Sir Thomas Browne, and Bunyan, and Burbage, on Burnet and Mrs. Browning, on Admiral Byng and Cassin.

d the murderess Elizabeth Brownrigg, and many others, make up two ried and valuable volumes.

Another little work, which is partly history and partly biography, is the teresting sketch of **Sir Philip Sidney**, which Mr. J. A. Symonds has contributed to the **English Men of Letters** series (Macmillan). Whatever Mr. Symonds writes is sure to be attractive, but in this little volume he is scarcely at his best. It is indeed a little difficult to see why Sir Philip Sidney has been singled out to stand by Spenser's side as representative of Elizabethan literature in Mr. Morley's series, when many other greater names of that epoch have hitherto received no mention. Many people also will be inclined to think that Sir Philip Sidney was far more of a patriotic politician, and of a gallant, generous-hearted soldier, than of a literary man; and others will argue that a monograph upon him was scarcely needed where Mr. Fox-Bourne holds the field. Mr. Symonds, however, gives us a well-written narrative of his life, and some very useful criticism upon his writings.

An Oxford historian has contributed a new volume to our histories. Professor Gardiner has published the first volume of his **History of the Great Civil War** (Longmans), which it is almost unnecessary to say is a continuation of his previously published works. It deals with the first three campaigns of the Civil War, from 1642 to 1644, and forms the first of three volumes which Professor Gardiner intends to devote to the subject. These years were for the Parliament the most critical period of the war. Had Charles been able to turn to account the advantages he gained in his first two campaigns he might have terminated the struggle in his favour, and have given a different future to English history. But when the close of the year 1644 found the Parliament still unsubdued, in spite of the checks and reverses it had suffered, it must have been obvious to all onlookers that the triumph of the Parliament was only a matter of time. The tide had already turned against the king. Professor Gardiner's theme in this volume is naturally the early triumphs of the Royalist arms; and his narrative is illustrated by plans and coloured maps, which enable one to follow clearly the complicated series of events. It is needless to say that the manner of telling them is equal in interest to the events themselves.

Professor Baird, of New York, has also published a new work, which is in great measure a continuation of a former one. **The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre** (Kegan Paul), which opens with the accession of Henry of Navarre in 1574, is a history of the fortunes of the French Huguenots during the critical and unsettled period which followed the massacre of St. Bartholomew down to the death of Henry IV. in 1610. The religious wars of the seventeenth century in France are so closely interwoven with the general story of the country, that the historian of the Huguenots must necessarily be the historian of France. The first of Professor Baird's two volumes is consequently occupied with a history of the "Holy League," and of the war which it provoked, of the proscription of the Huguenots, and of the manœuvres and campaigns of Guise; and the history of the League is also the chief theme of the opening chapters of the second volume. Not a few fine and heroic figures come upon the stage. Condé and François de Chatillon are scarcely inferior to Henry of Navarre in high qualities and in dramatic fortunes. But it is of course round Henry that the chief interest of these volumes centres: he is the loved hero of the party of which Professor Baird is the chronicler; and it is his *policy and his genius*, and last, but not least, his celebrated act of abjuration

tion, which determine the action of his party and ultimately decide the fate of France.

Mr. Pears has produced an interesting volume, entitled somewhat dubiously **The Fall of Constantinople** (Longmans), the object of which is to elucidate the history of the fourth crusade. The title of the work is really less ambiguous than it appears, for Mr. Pears considers that the fall of Constantinople in 1204 was necessarily the "prelude to the Ottoman conquest in 1453." A large part of Mr. Pears's book is devoted to a picture of the condition of the Eastern Empire at the beginning of the thirteenth century, and to an account of the causes which had brought it to such a pitch of weakness. It is not until his eighth chapter that he takes up the narrative of the crusade, but thenceforth his sketch of events is clear and instructive. Much of course of the ground which he has covered is still a matter of controversy, but Mr. Pears's remarks on these disputed points—on the conduct of Venice and Dandolo's designs, on the policy and behaviour of the Crusaders themselves, and on the attitude taken by, and the real motives which influenced, Boniface and Philip of Swabia and Innocent III.—are well worthy of study, even if they do not command unanimous assent. An earlier period of European history has been lightly handed in a little volume by Mr. Barlow, entitled **The Normans in South Europe** (Kegan Paul), who has selected a few of the prominent events of the period which he chronicles, and brought them before our notice in an attractive way. The book is, in fact, a brief sketch of the settlement of the Normans in Italy and Sicily, and of the exploits of Robert Guiscard, interspersed with plenty of narrative and anecdote, and with just sufficient historical matter to entitle it to be called an historical work.

Professor Montagu-Burrows has happily been induced to publish a fascinating but unwieldy volume upon the history of **The Family of Brocas of Beaurepaire** (Longmans). There is much of course in this stout volume which is merely matter of private interest to the representatives of the family of Brocas; there is a great bulk of deeds and papers; and there are sketches of the English and French descendants of the family which will not be of general public interest. The real value and charm of the work lies in the earlier part of it, in the account it contains of the old Brocas family, who in the fourteenth century, as the servants and favourites of Edward III. and Richard II., came very near to the highest fortune; who fought at Crecy and Poitiers, who held a variety of court offices, the chief of which was the old historic place of Master of the Royal Buckhounds, and who fell from their high estate with the fall of Richard II. The third book, with its picture of the family fortunes in the fifteenth century, and some parts of the fourth book are pleasant reading too, but the historical value of the work centres round the first two books, which contain the history of the Brocas knights and a great deal of useful information relative to the English rule in Aquitaine.

We have received five interesting little volumes belonging to the series of **English Worthies** (Longmans), which Mr. Lang is editing. Two of these volumes, by Mr. Gosse and Mr. Hannay, are occupied with the lives of two famous English sailors, who were not only sailors but something else as well. Mr. Gosse's sketch of Raleigh is an endeavour, and a very successful endeavour, to give us a picture of Raleigh's personal life, dissociated as far as possible from the public history of the times of which he was so brilliant a figure. Thus Mr. Gosse passes rapidly over some public events of signal importance, such as the defeat of the Spanish Armada, in which Raleigh took only a secondary

art, and confines himself to those circumstances which strictly form a part of his hero's career. On the other hand, Mr. Hannay's life of Blake is necessarily a narrative of the naval episodes of the period in which Blake lived, and centres chiefly round the events of the Dutch war and the struggle with van Tromp and De Ruyter. Mr. Symonds contributes to the series a brilliant little biography of Ben Jonson, full of that happy mixture of criticism and history which Mr. Symonds knows so well how to produce. Broadly speaking, two chapters at the beginning trace Jonson's life up to the opening of his literary career. The middle of the book is an estimate of his poetical work, and the little volume finishes with a sketch of the great dramatist's old age. Mr. Austin Dobson gives us a brief biography of Steele, written as only a biographer can write who knows his subject through and through. It is a fascinating picture of a very fascinating career; for of all the brilliant figures of his age, none perhaps is so attractive as the soldier, dramatist, essayist, letter-writer, politician, and theatrical manager, Richard Steele. Mr. Lang's series will be well worth reading if all the literary biographies are as well written as those of Jonson and of Steele. Politically, perhaps, the most interesting biography of this series is Mr. H. D. Traill's life of the 1st Earl of Shaftesbury. It has been Mr. Traill's object to avoid as far as possible the reproach of partisanship, to guard against the malicious strictures of Lord Campbell on the one hand, and against what he considers the undue partiality of Mr. Christie on the other. Taking it for granted that ambition was at all times Shaftesbury's master-passion, and that an adroit combination of principle and interest was the highest aim which he ever set before himself, Mr. Traill succeeds in steering an even course between the extremes of previous biographers. His sketch is interesting and attractively written, and he appreciates to some extent the parliamentary importance of his hero's career. But one cannot help wishing that the character of the book were a little less sketchy, and that the desire to steer a middle course did not always compel Mr. Traill to suggest reasonable and probable explanations of facts which are hard to understand, but which might wear a different face if studied with more accuracy and patience and with more historical search. The man of the world is useful as a critic, but his views, though eminently sensible, may not always be quite historically just.

Side by side with these volumes stands the **Eminent Women Series** of Messrs. Allen, to which Miss Mathilde Blind has contributed a life of Madame Roland. It is no small tribute to the author's success in dealing with her subject that she has been able to make the first half of her book, which deals with "Manon" Philipon's early life, with her suitors, her marriage to Roland, and her visits to England and Switzerland, and her home at Lyons, nearly as interesting as the latter half. But of course it is from the time when, in February 1790, Roland and his wife came to Paris and took rooms in the rue Guénégaud, that the dramatic interest of Madame Roland's life begins. Miss Mathilde Blind is a sympathetic biographer, and well able to follow her heroine through the stirring scenes of her brief history, to appreciate her passionate devotion to the republican ideal, for which so many brave men and her party needlessly sacrificed their lives, and to do justice to the constancy with which she died. We have also to mention a sketch of Susanna Wesley by Miss Eliza Clarke, and a life of Margaret of Angoulême and Catherine de' Medici which Miss Mary Robinson has contributed to the series. The other of the great founder of Methodism was the twenty-fifth child of a poor Samuel Annesley, a poor country parson whose means were less large



than his family, and was born in Spital Yard on January 20. marriage with Samuel Wesley, the birth and bringing up of and the circumstances of a surprisingly uneventful life are some detail by the author; and a large number of letters, very another in tone and matter, lend a flavour of personal interest of the doings of a domestic circle. Compared with the case of Wesley, Miss Robinson has a theme which appears sensational, and she gives us a vivid and enthusiastic sketch of the Queen of Navarre; although one cannot help thinking that she undervalues the Heptameron, and takes a somewhat unusual view of Margaret's own work and of the literature of the time. It is Miss Robinson permits the shadow of Diana of Poitiers so to darken her estimate of the frivolous but brilliant age of Henry I a successful little book.

Beside the lives of these eminent women we may place Miss's attractive account of another celebrated lady, **Madame de M<sup>rs</sup> Friends** (Bentley). Few of the famous *salons* of Paris are more than the *salon* of Madame Mohl, the young Englishwoman who, as Clarke, was the friend of Chateaubriand and Fauriel and Quir as the wife of the German *savant*, remained to an advanced queen of the most brilliant society of Paris. Naturally, Miss's book is full of good stories, and of anecdotes which will often and one is tempted to regret that this sketch of a very long life longer in itself.

But there are several biographies this year of a more solid kind, and first among them stands what it is no exaggeration to call the life of Gordon. Of course, there is not very much that is new in Henry Gordon's account of the **Events in the Life of General Gordon** (Kegan Paul), but it is the only life of Gordon which we would wish to possess and to preserve. There are many amusing anecdotes of Gordon's boyhood, and especially of his mischief-loving days; but of course the great interest of the book centres round the public life. It is no small advantage to be able to enrich that public life with the personal knowledge which Sir Henry Gordon has. There is much added to our knowledge of the Chinese exploits of China, though it is interesting to have his own account of the capture of the fresh matter which Sir Henry supplies relates chiefly to Gordon's return to Cairo in 1879, and to his conduct at the Cape with regard to the Sudan and the account given us of the first of these incidents is full as to Gordon's memorandum of the negotiation which he entered into with the Khedive's request, with a view to settling the financial difficulties of the country is now printed in full; and we are able to see how far the English and French Governments are for the failure of which might have obviated Araby's revolt, and the long sequence of disasters which have followed in its train. Gordon's opinion that unpaid officers and the people of Egypt should be considered as bondholders thought of afterwards. The English and French Governments took an opposite view, and they negatived Gordon's proposals, but would not have been agreeable to the creditors." Two other small interests are brought out clearly by Sir Henry Gordon. The first is his brother's resignation of the post of secretary to Lord Ripon, and the belief that Yakoub Khan was innocent of the murder

to his reluctance to be in any way responsible for his punishment. And second is this: that he sympathised so keenly with the sufferings and misfortunes of the people of Ireland, especially after his visit to the West Coast, as to have planned out a scheme for their relief, singularly resembling certain more recent proposals, which in other quarters have found scanty favour. It may be well to quote some words he uses in speaking of the Irish people. "I believe that these people are made as we are, that they are patient beyond belief, loyal, but at the same time broken-spirited and desperate, living on the verge of starvation, in places where we would not keep our cattle." And yet Charles Gordon has rarely been regarded as an unpatriotic man. It is only natural that the latter part of this biography should be largely mixed up with political considerations, but Sir Henry Gordon, in dealing with the final tragedy of Khartoum, endeavours to attach no blame except where it is due, and exonerates Sir Charles Wilson and Colonel Kitchener from responsibility for mistakes which were not theirs. His account of the spirit in which Charles Gordon set out for the Soudan is at the least touching episode in a book which is full of vivid personal characteristics, and worthy of the great life it endeavours to record.

Another unpretending little book by Major de Cosson, **Days and Nights of Service with Sir Gerald Graham's Field Force at Suakin** (Murray), contributes a good deal of information to our knowledge of recent Egyptian history. Like other books of the kind, it is full of interest, and exposes not a few of the many blunders which accompanied our army's course in that campaign. Among these, the faulty disposition of the camp, the random shooting of the men—owing to the fact that some of them had never fired full-cartridge until they practised at a target in sailing up the Red Sea—and the mistakes committed even by the ablest generals, are naturally the most prominent. Major de Cosson seems to think that the battle at Hasheen was either well directed nor strategically useful, and it is scarcely possible to form a much more favourable opinion of the chief incident of this part of the war—the surprise, and the fight which followed the surprise, of March 1, at Sir John McNeill's zareba at Tofrek. But a fuller account of the **Egyptian Campaigns** (Hurst & Blackett) is contained in the two volumes which Mr. Royle has published on the subject. Mr. Royle has introduced his narrative by an account, judiciously selected from blue-books and newspapers, of the political events which led up to the war. The description of the now famous bombardment of Alexandria is clear and vigorous; and, indeed, the whole story of the military and naval events, down to the destruction of the Egyptian forces at Tel-el-Kebir, is well told and well worth reading. Mr. Royle then goes on to narrate the story of the massacre of Hicks Pasha's army, and of Baker Pasha's troops, and gradually brings his readers down to the date of the first Suakin expedition. His criticisms on the victory of El-Teb, and on General Graham's conduct in connection with that battle, are both judicious and just, although necessarily rather severe. Equally frank, and the more telling because of their obvious fairness, are Mr. Royle's strictures upon the conduct of the relief expedition to Khartoum, and the choice of the Nile route; and his discussion of Sir Charles Wilson's conduct is temperate and just. The account which he gives of Sir Gerald Graham's second expedition brings his history of military events to a close, and he amply bears out the testimony of Major de Cosson as to the grave errors of generalship committed in that little war. In connection with these books on *Egyptian history* we may mention that we have received the

speeches, she has done far more than this: she has given us the very noble and gallant man, and she has made a valuable addition to our knowledge of the history of the Punjab, a province which was peculiarly associated with Sir Herbert Edwardes's name. Edwardes came to India for the first time in 1841, and within a few years was to take a very active part, as a member of Sir Hugh Gough's army, in the first Sikh war. After the conclusion of that war he was selected by Sir Henry Lawrence as one of his assistants at the Sikh court, and a very strong bond of mutual respect and affection sprang up between the two men that early date Sir Henry Lawrence declared that, "taking his physical activity, mental cultivation, and warmth of heart," he had in India the equal of Herbert Edwardes; and in those early years were laid the foundations of a lasting friendship between the two men, who continued in common, which ended only with Lawrence's death. In 1848 Edwardes highly distinguished himself in his conduct of a difficult mission, in which he was entrusted at Bunnoo, and in the following year he was placed at the head of a public service which at once placed him in the front rank of Indian administrators. Lady Edwardes gives a full and very interesting account of this conspicuous service, the avenging of the murder of Agnes Selous, and the suppression of Moobraj's rebellion, which was not only accomplished, but to a great extent accomplished, by a small army, hastily raised in the face of the gravest difficulties, under the command of a young officer. It was only natural that a few years later, when Lord Dalhousie was seeking for an efficient administrator to fill the arduous and important post of Commissioner at Peshawur, he should have selected Herbert Edwardes for the post; and it was in this difficult post that Edwardes rendered his most valuable services. It was to him, as his wife makes plain, that the initiation of the policy which John Lawrence at first opposed, but which was afterwards completely adopted, the policy of making allies of the Afghans, was almost wholly due: and the value of that alliance was surely

chiefly with her husband's later career, and which includes many letters and speeches, and contains many indications of his strong religious convictions, and of his desire to "Christianise" India, is necessarily less interesting than the first. Lady Edwardes has, perhaps, been occasionally betrayed into the feelings of a partisan; but that may well be pardoned to one who tells so ably the story of the life of a great hero and a very noble-hearted man.

A very different story is contained in the memoirs of Hobart Pasha. These *Sketches from my Life* (Longmans) contain the history of a most adventurous career and the biography of a most adventurous man, and though written with no pretensions to style, and with a wonderful disregard of dates, make up a delightful book. Admiral Hobart was born in 1822, and as a boy received a nomination to a British man-of-war of the worst old-fashioned type, wherein he soon began to see service. He was present in the Spanish war at St. Sebastian. Thence he was sent to South America, where he spent some time in an idle but exciting life, occupied chiefly in sporting adventures and in hunting slave-dealers and rescuing slaves. On his return to England he was appointed to a post on the Queen's yacht, and thence was transferred to the Mediterranean station, and subsequently to the Baltic fleet during the Crimean war. Not the least interesting part of the book is the account which he gives of his adventures in blockade-running during the American war, while he was waiting for a command as post-captain. Hobart was an ardent sympathiser with the Southern cause, and made the acquaintance of Davis and Lee, for whom he entertained a great admiration. At the close of the war he wandered about Europe, and chance led to his obtaining an appointment in the Sultan's service. There is much in the book that is interesting about his service with the Turkish Government, who appreciated his high qualities, and with whom he lived on excellent terms. Altogether there is a variety of interest in these memoirs which makes them very pleasant reading for any one who likes to read the story of an adventurous and exciting life.

A very different class of military officer is dealt with in Major Walford's little book upon *The Parliamentary Generals* (Chapman & Hall), which is practically a continuous history of the Great Civil War, from its outbreak in 1642 down to the final triumph of Cromwell in the "crowning mercy" of Worcester fight. Major Walford's plan has been to relate the achievements of each general—Essex, Fairfax, Cromwell, Waller, Treton, Fleetwood, Lambert, Blake, and Monk—as the circumstances of the war brought each in turn to the front; and thus he preserves the continuity of events. The book is illustrated by useful little maps, and prefaced by a short discussion of the arms and tactics of the period. We notice that Major Walford is a thorough-going admirer of Cromwell, even to the extent of condoning the massacres which marked his Irish campaign.

The year brings us several books dealing with the lives of prominent Americans, and first among these biographies stand the *Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant* (Sampson Low). General Grant is, after Washington, the military hero of the United States, and may claim, even from a strictly military point of view, to stand high in the second rank of eminent commanders. Ulysses Grant was born at Point Pleasant, Ohio, on April 27, 1822. His father was a tanner and farmer, and as a boy, up to seventeen years of age, Grant spent the hours, which were not occupied in school, in working on his father's farm. His education at Georgetown seems to have been indifferent at the best. In 1848 he graduated, and soon after he was

appointed a lieutenant of infantry. For a long time he felt a strong distaste for the military career, and, becoming engaged soon after he entered the army, he turned his attentions to the study of mathematics, in the hope of obtaining a professorship and being able to quit the army. But the outbreak of the Mexican war interrupted his plans and condemned him to a soldier's life. For some years after the conclusion of that war he was stationed in garrison in various places in the States, and at last, in 1853, he resigned his commission, to enter at the age of thirty-two upon a new struggle for support. He first tried farming, then he became partner in an estate agency business; then, in 1860, he removed to Galena in Illinois, and became a clerk in his father's store. From this obscure position he was raised, in the early summer of 1861, to the post of colonel of a volunteer regiment in Illinois. The great war had broken out. From that moment Ulysses Grant embarked on a career of almost unbroken success. He was rapidly raised to the rank of brigadier-general and of major-general of volunteers, the latter after his successful Fort Donelson campaign. For a time it seemed as if his success were likely to be impeded by the unfriendliness of his commanding officer, General Halleck; but Grant's merit was able to triumph over official disapprobation. A full and interesting account is given by the general of the important battle of Shiloh in April 1862, in which he played so large a part, and a very clear narrative follows of the memorable capture of Vicksburg. The successful issue of the operations at Chattanooga brought Grant the reward of his services, and in March 1864 he received his commission as lieutenant-general of the army and commander of all the forces in the field. On April 9, 1865, General Lee surrendered, and the war was at an end. There is ample evidence in the book of the troubles with which Grant had to contend, from the wanton interference of some of the officials at Washington, and more especially from the want of discipline among his troops. It is no slight testimony to the character of General Grant that his extraordinary and rapid success never seems to have affected his judgment or to have shaken his temperate modesty; and that a man who from obscurity and penury was suddenly raised to the first place in his country's estimation, and twice filled the post of President, should be able to write as justly, as simply, and as unostentatiously as he writes in the volumes now before us.

Three other books before us claim to relate the lives of American statesmen. Mr. Rice has edited a series of **Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln** (Blackwood), contributed, at his request, by some of the most distinguished of the great president's contemporaries and friends. The result is a somewhat unwieldy volume of between six and seven hundred pages, which contains in full the recollections of each of these distinguished writers, amplified by biographical sketches of them by the editor, and ornamented with their portraits. Naturally these recollections are full of anecdotes and information relative to almost every period of Lincoln's life, only it is rather a pity that some of the best of these anecdotes frequently contradict each other. The least valuable portions of the book are those contributed by Messrs. Beecher, Boutwell, Ingersoll, and Welling, but a patient reader will extract much that is interesting from the reminiscences of Mr. Kelly and Mr. Swett, and from the editorial matter of Mr. Rice. Besides these reminiscences of Lincoln, we have two new volumes in Mr. Morse's series of **American Statesmen** (Douglas), the life of Samuel Adams by Professor Hosmer, and the life of Thomas Jefferson by Mr. John Morse himself. The



former is a compact little volume, full of course of political history, and not wanting in political argument. We shall not be thought to be depreciating its value if we say that it is more occupied with historical matters than with biographical or personal detail. It is clear, Professor Hosmer argues, "that Massachusetts led the thirteen colonies during the years preliminary to the Revolution," and "that Boston led Massachusetts." The author's object has been to make it equally clear that "it was Samuel Adams who led Boston." The early events of the great struggle, the Stamp Act quarrel, the conduct of Bernard, and the course of the preliminary controversies are very clearly sketched. A chapter is devoted to Hutchinson's letters, and another to Hutchinson and the Tories, but perhaps the most useful parts of the book are the two concluding chapters, which estimate Adams's character and career, and which relate the close in advanced old age of a singularly restless and remarkable life. Thomas Jefferson belongs of course to a younger generation. His reputation, indeed, was already made when the celebrated Declaration of Independence severed the last link which bound the colonies to England; but the importance of his political career belongs to the days that followed the great war of enfranchisement. He was essentially a post-revolutionary, as Samuel Adams was conspicuously a pre-revolutionary statesman. It would be an interesting speculation to inquire how far Jefferson's views were influenced by his intimate relations with the Liberal party in France, during the eventful years which followed his transference from the governorship of Virginia to the post of Minister at the Court of France. Certainly his sympathies with Lafayette and the advanced party would seem in the first days of the French Revolution to have exceeded strict official limits, and his democratic doctrines would seem occasionally to have been more staunch than well considered. The greater part of Mr. Morse's interesting little volume is naturally occupied with a record of Jefferson's career as Secretary of State, as Vice-President, and as twice President of the Republic; and the book closes with a picture of the great civilian's retirement at Monticello, and of his honourable old age and death. Perhaps it has rarely been given to any man to achieve for himself, and to hold for so long a period, power so complete and so extensive, and, after relinquishing it, to retire with a popularity even greater than that which had placed him in power. Did Jefferson deserve such high fortune?

Mr. Hodder has lost no time in producing, in three substantial volumes, his *Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury* (Cassell). Towards the end of his life Lord Shaftesbury placed in Mr. Hodder's hands his private diaries and papers, so that the volumes now published have in them a great deal of autobiographical matter. Lord Shaftesbury was born in London in April 1801, and passed an unhappy boyhood in very uncongenial surroundings. It is, possibly, from the impressions of his childhood that he derived something of that austerity which subsequently marked his demeanour, as well as some of that tenderness towards children which inspired so much of his public career. Of his active, busy life there are many points to be chronicled, and Mr. Hodder does his task with pains and discretion. A long chapter, the twenty-third, is devoted to a discussion of Lord Shaftesbury's religious convictions, which played so large a part in determining his life. He was, in his own words, "an Evangelical of the Evangelicals," believing in them as a party, and reverencing their peculiar tenets as the highest expression of religious faith. He held with profound

conviction the "belief in the doctrine of the second coming of our Lord." He was a prominent opponent both of the Tractarian movement and of the revulsion of feeling which has since produced the "Essays and Reviews," and such books as "Ecce Homo." In what might be called the politics of religion he came forward as a firm supporter of Lord John Russell's Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. But the place which Lord Shaftesbury earned in the public estimation was not determined by his religious views. Among the almost innumerable philanthropic movements of which Mr. Hodder's book is to some extent necessarily a record, special prominence is of course given to the agitation for factory reform. It was not till 1830 that "the great and comprehensive movement with which, later on, Lord Ashley was to be identified commenced;" and very soon after that movement began Lord Ashley threw himself into it heart and soul. From that time down to the end of his long life, every form of hard-worked operative, from the artisan, the miner, and the agricultural labourer, down to the chimney-sweep and the acrobat, was sure of having his wrongs made public, and of unremitting efforts being made to redress them by Lord Shaftesbury, and the great philanthropic community of which he became the leader and the head. Two other great movements are brought prominently forward by Mr. Hodder as specially illustrative of his hero's career—the movement which ended in the establishment of ragged schools, and the gradually increasing effort to provide better homes for the poor. But these are only the most prominent among services which were as various as the labour they involved was arduous, and which collectively have built up a lasting memorial to the great Lord Shaftesbury's name.

Three Englishmen have come forward to give us a picture of Victor Hugo's life, and an estimate of the great poet's work. Naturally, Mr. Swinburne's **Study of Victor Hugo** (Chatto & Windus) takes rank first, but Mr. Barnett Smith's *Life* (Ward & Downey) and Mr. Cappon's *Memoir* (Blackwood) form admirable supplements to Mr. Swinburne's book. Mr. Smith's book is chiefly devoted to the story of Hugo's active life. Mr. Cappon's is a criticism of Hugo's writings, and practically nothing else. Mr. Swinburne's work is a rhapsody, chiefly devoted to literary eulogy. The author of "La Légende des Siècles" is compared to his advantage with Æschylus, Sophocles, Isaiah, and Shakespeare; and Mr. Swinburne's work cannot be called criticism if criticism is held to imply anything but utterly unstinted praise. Mr. Swinburne's position is rather that of defending against the world his claim to set up Victor Hugo in the forefront of the world's greatest poets; and in defending his position he has the advantages not only of eloquence and insight, but of almost unmatched knowledge of his subject as well. His work is by no means the "brief and simple summary" that it affects to be; it is a very eloquent and ample exposition of Hugo's greatness, both as a poet and as a writer of prose. Mr. Swinburne is better qualified, perhaps, than any living Englishman to tell us what to admire in "Les Misérables," in "Hernani," in "Le Roi s'amuse," in "Les Travailleurs de la Mer," in "Marion de Lorme," in Hugo's innumerable great works in prose and verse: the only question we have to decide is whether we ought to admire them *quite* as much as he suggests. Mr. Cappon and Mr. Barnett Smith are both best perhaps in discussing Hugo's prose: both are occasionally severe, and both are very warm admirers. Not the least interesting portion of Mr. Smith's book is the part where he points out how utterly different from Hugo's warm-hearted idealism are the modern developments of French

thought, and how far removed the Zolaistic France of recent days is from the France for which Victor Hugo lived, and would have very willingly died.

Mr. Samuel Longfellow has edited with good taste and judgment the **Life of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow** (Kegan Paul), with the result of having given to the world an interesting and pleasant biography of the celebrated American poet. Perhaps these two substantial volumes contain rather more of the details of a good but not very eventful life than is necessary in a work of permanent value; but at any rate it is pleasant to have Longfellow constantly speaking for himself, as he is made to do, in the numerous extracts from journals and correspondence which the volumes contain. Henry Longfellow was born in Portland, Maine, in February 1807, and was the son of Mr. Stephen Longfellow, a well-known lawyer, and at one time a member of Congress. He seems to have been a sensitive, intelligent, vigorous boy. In 1822 he went to Bowdoin College, and graduated there in 1825. Soon after that he started on a long visit to Europe, to study languages in France, Germany, Spain, Italy, and other countries, and on his return he was appointed Professor of Modern Languages at Bowdoin College. Thence he was, after a period of useful service, transferred to a more valuable post at Harvard University. In September 1831 he married, but lost his wife four years later, and thereupon he again set forth upon his travels; but in December 1836 he returned to America, and settled down for life at Cambridge. His second wife, a woman of deep feeling and refinement, who lived with him happily for eighteen years, was killed in a terrible accident in 1861, and after her death Longfellow once more visited Europe. To the last he retained his active habits and all his intellectual powers, and he was of course a most prolific writer. Mr. Samuel Longfellow's sketch, in short, is the portrait of a genial, manly, conscientious, and cultivated man, endowed with large gifts, and with a singularly upright, happy disposition, thoroughly in harmony with the conception which readers of Longfellow's poems would be likely to form of the poet himself. Side by side with the life of Longfellow stands Professor Dowden's monumental biography of **Percy Bysshe Shelley** (Kegan Paul), written under the sanction of the Shelley family, and embodying much information that has been too long inaccessible or reserved. Perhaps the most valuable item in the materials thus set at Professor Dowden's disposal is the journal kept by Mary Shelley, from the day of her flight with Shelley down to the close of his life, which forms the basis of the biography after July 1814. This has enabled Professor Dowden "to fill up passages of the life hitherto almost blank—as, for example, the story of that period of poverty in London which followed Shelley's first return from the Continent;" and only second in importance to this, as material for the biography, are Miss Clairmont's journals and note-books, which have been lent by Mr. Forman, and have also been turned to good account. Professor Dowden has devoted three chapters to Shelley's early life, including his career at Oxford, with his first attempts at authorship, and the beginning of his intimacy with Hogg; and these are followed by three more chapters dealing with Shelley's wanderings in Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Professor Dowden investigates with great care and at some length the curious Tanyrallt problem, the alleged murderous assault committed upon Shelley at Tanyrallt, in Carnarvonshire, in February 1818, but fails to come to any conclusion as to the truth of that extraordinary story. The next question with which he has to deal is the separation of Shelley from his first wife, and

the subsequent elopement with Mary Godwin. This, of course, remains to Professor Dowden, as it has always been to students of Shelley's life, the most difficult problem which that life contains. But Professor Dowden has some new evidence to offer with regard to Harriet's alienation from her husband, and also with regard to the more disputable point of her alleged infidelity to him. As to the latter question, Professor Dowden wisely refrains from pronouncing an opinion, but he seems to think that Shelley undoubtedly believed in the misconduct of his wife. At any rate, he considers it certain that Shelley went abroad with Mary under the fixed conviction that Harriet was willing that they should both be relieved from the marriage tie. As to the period—the autumn of 1814—when the poet was living in great poverty in London, Professor Dowden has a great deal to say that is quite new; and the same remark applies to the chapter which deals with the Chancery proceedings in 1817 and 1818. The greater part of the second volume is of course occupied with the four years—the four closing years of Shelley's life—which were passed in Italy, much of them in the companionship of Mary Godwin, and Byron, and Hunt, and Claire Clairmont. Not the least interesting feature of these two volumes is the appearance in them, for the first time, of several poems by Shelley hitherto unknown. The merit of these poems is very unequal, but some of them are of such beauty as to make one wish to see the entire series published. As regards the great poet's character, on the whole the effect of these volumes is to raise Shelley's reputation, perhaps the more in that they are so obviously free from partisanship. His high qualities, his generosity, his resource, his affectionateness, his courteous bearing, his decision, and his common-sense stand out clearly distinguished from the whims and eccentricities and irregularities which have sometimes been unjustly allowed to obscure them. Rarely has a character been so hard to draw or so difficult to estimate as Shelley's; and we may cordially thank Professor Dowden for the impartial and laborious efforts which he has made to enable us to arrive at the truth.

Mr. Norton has done well to edit the **Early Letters of Thomas Carlyle** (Macmillan). He is one of the very large public to whom "the view of Mr. Carlyle's character presented in Mr. Froude's biography has not approved itself," and his avowed object is to destroy the unfavourable impression of Carlyle which Mr. Froude's work created. The charges which Mr. Norton brings against Mr. Froude, especially with regard to the latter's treatment of the documents put at his disposal, are very grave charges indeed; and Mr. Froude's confessed inability or unwillingness to answer them goes far to substantiate their accuracy. The gravest charges of all are in relation to Mr. Froude's misrepresentations as to the feelings which subsisted between Carlyle and his wife. To correct and expose these misrepresentations Mr. Norton has ventured to disobey Carlyle's injunctions so far as to publish certain portions of the correspondence between Carlyle and Miss Welsh before their marriage. His belief, which the public have generally shared, was "that Mr. Froude had distorted their significance, and had given a view of the relations between Carlyle and his future wife in essential respects incorrect and injurious to their memory;" and in an appendix of sixteen pages Mr. Norton has endeavoured to some extent to set this right. Other parts of these volumes are almost equally interesting, especially the new evidence given of Carlyle's devotion to his own family and to his college friends. But it is round the relations of Thomas Carlyle and Jane Welsh that the chief interest centres; and the disclosures which Mr. Norton has to

take on that subject fully justify him in his assertion that Mr. Froude's narrative has been "elaborated with the art of a practised romancer, in which assertion and inference, unsupported by evidence or contradictory to it, often take the place of correct statement."

Two books of memoirs are before us of men who have played a prominent part in the society of a generation which is now gone or is rapidly passing away. **The Reminiscences and Opinions of Sir Francis Doyle** (Longmans) are as agreeable and chatty a book of recollections as they were expected to be. He was born in the year 1810, and his experiences at Eton, at Oxford, and in London threw him almost from the time of his boyhood into the company of celebrated men. Sir Francis Doyle has been an admirable scholar, an excellent critic, a spirited writer of verse, an Oxford professor, and a great authority upon horse-racing; and his book of personal memoirs is as various in its interests as the author himself. There is much that is new in this volume about the writer's early friends, about Arthur Hallam, Milnes Gaskell, Cornwall Lewis, and others; and there are some delightful reminiscences of Mr. Gladstone, written by one who was his intimate friend many long years ago. Here and there, too, are interspersed with the stories interesting passages of literary criticism, a defence of Macaulay's "Lays," and a depreciatory comment upon "Lycidas," and there are some amusing anecdotes of legal personages. Sir Francis Doyle would appear to take a grumbling, melancholy view of latter-day politics, and perhaps the best of his reminiscences date from the earlier portion of his life. The volume ends with some verses upon General Gordon. Side by side with Sir Francis Doyle's recollections stands the **Correspondence of Abraham Hayward** (Murray), which Mr. Carlisle has edited with careful notes, and prefaced with an account of Hayward's early life. The correspondence covers the years between 1834 and 1884. Much of it, of course, is composed of Hayward's letters to his sisters and others, telling them where he had dined, whom he had met, whom he had entertained at his famous parties in King's Bench Walk. But the most interesting letters in the correspondence are some of those written to Hayward by various celebrated personages, including several brilliant and charming notes from Mrs. Norton, who was one of Hayward's oldest and most faithful friends. Abraham Hayward was born at Wilton in 1801, and as a boy went to school in Bath and Tiverton. From school he went to a solicitor's in Somersetshire, and served his time as a pupil, but in 1824 he changed his profession for the bar, and entered himself at the Inner Temple. At first he studied diligently at the bar, but he soon began to interest himself in other things. He was a prominent speaker at the London Debating Society, to which Mill and Roebuck and Charles Austen belonged. In 1831 he published his prose translation of "Faust," which first made his reputation in the literary world; and thenceforward he embarked on the career of ephemeral literature which afterwards became the chief business of his life. Beginning life as a Tory, Hayward followed the fortunes of the Peelites, and seems to have throughout his career sympathised largely with Mr. Gladstone. His rebuff by the Benchers of the Inner Temple, who declined to elect him into their body on his appointment as a Q.C. in 1845, led him to abandon the law, and to devote himself more than ever to literature and politics. He seems more than once to have expected an official appointment, but he never obtained one; though his correspondence with Mr. Gladstone, Sir G. C. Lewis, the late Lord Lytton, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and others continued to be full of



political references and advice, even down to recent times, when his own hopes of obtaining office had long disappeared. Up to the age of eighty-three Hayward continued to dine and play whist at the Athenæum, and to enjoy to the full "the best London society," of which it was his pride and gratification to be an acknowledged and a brilliant member.

The year has produced two other biographies of a very different kind from these—Mr. John Brown's life of **John Bunyan** (Isbister), and an interesting little memoir by the Rev. Frederick Arnold of **Robertson of Brighton** (Ward & Downey). Mr. Brown is the successor of Bunyan as minister of the congregation at Bedford, and has given us a biography of the great dreamer which is not only readable—other biographies of him have been that to an equal if not greater degree—but also accurate and full as well. He has of course had recourse to the information which, previously to Mr. Offor's work, had lain hidden in the State Paper Office, and has turned his opportunities to excellent account; and he has also examined the court rolls of the manor, and the documents preserved in the archidiaconal registry at Bedford. Yet even the materials which Mr. Brown has been able to discover are scanty enough. There is, in fact, too little to tell about Bunyan's life; but whatever knowledge is to be had upon the subject will be found in Mr. Brown's admirable and attractive book. The discriminating notices of Bunyan's works which it contains are not the least valuable part of the volume; and Mr. Brown has furnished it with an index, which, however, might with advantage be made much more complete. Mr. Arnold's memoir of Frederick William Robertson is of course a much slighter work. Mr. Arnold is of opinion that Mr. Stopford Brooke's work brings out only "the ministerial character of Robertson"; his own effort has been to illustrate the "brilliant, humorous, many-sided" private character of the man. Mr. Arnold's little volume deals of course chiefly with Robertson's life at Brighton, and with his connection with some distinguished friends, notably with Lady Byron; and it concludes with an interesting discussion of the nature and effects of Robertson's religious teaching. Naturally Mr. Arnold has an unstinted admiration for the character and influence of the man of whom he writes and believes, with Dean Stanley, whom he quotes, that Robertson was "the greatest of modern English preachers."

Two Church histories have appeared, covering to a large extent the same ground. Mr. Charles Abbey, the rector of Checkendon, who has already produced, with Canon Overton's assistance, a history of the English Church in the eighteenth century, now publishes two volumes entitled **The English Church and its Bishops, 1700–1800** (Longmans), which at first sight it appears rather difficult to differentiate in matter and title from the preceding work. These two volumes grew, Mr. Abbey tells us, out of a desire "to illustrate the history of the English Church in that century by sketches from the lives of its prelates;" but this scheme was found to demand a "general survey" of English Church history during the period, and in course of time this "general survey" developed itself into a connected history. The result of this somewhat ambiguous explanation is that Mr. Abbey has produced two more substantial volumes on eighteenth century ecclesiastical history, interspersed with three or four chapters rather more specially devoted to the bishops themselves. It is a little difficult to resist the conclusion either that both this and the preceding work cover the same ground, or else that each leaves out a good deal of matter which is somewhat essential to a study of the period. At any rate, the period itself is a peculiarly unattractive and

creditable period of English Church history. The same remark as to the same it treats of applies to Mr. Hore's history of **The Church in England from William III. to Victoria** (Parker). This work is considerable in bulk, copious in detail, well arranged, and often interesting. Mr. Hore himself inclines towards the High Church party, but his tone is on the whole moderate and judicious. Perhaps his estimate of Wesley and Whitefield, and his account of the evangelical school, are briefer and less appreciative than one could wish, but Mr. Hore shows much care and some spirit in tracing the history of the English Church in the stormy days of the Revolution up to its supremacy in the reign of Anne. He attaches great importance to the Nonjuring movement, and describes sympathetically the career of Hancock. Nor is his historical judgment impaired when he comes to deal with the Tractarian movement of the present reign. But it is a great pity that Mr. Hore has marred the impartial character of his history by the introduction of some concluding matter which is purely polemical, and is not history at all.

**The Hulsean Lectures, 1885** (Cambridge University Press), are devoted to a study of St. Augustine, and Mr. Cunningham has published an interesting and thoughtful book. The place which St. Augustine occupies in the history of Christian thought is discussed in two excursions, one dealing with his influence in the Middle Ages, the other with his influence on the English Church; and translations from some passages in St. Augustine's works, notably from the "De Trinitate" and the "Enchiridion," are inserted in the lectures. One cannot help regretting a little that Mr. Cunningham is so often thought it necessary to apologise for St. Augustine, and to explain away St. Augustine's views; but the lectures on the whole have much interest in them, and are animated by the liberal sympathies which distinguish Mr. Cunningham's work. We may perhaps class with the Hulsean lectures two volumes of sermons which we have received—Mr. Grimley's book, entitled **The Temple of Humanity** (Kegan Paul), and a smaller volume, called **Liberalism in Religion**, by Mr. Page Roberts (Smith & Elder). The former of these two books contains some forty sermons preached at various times by the rector of Norton, dealing with a great variety of religious thoughts. To those who know Mr. Grimley's previous volume of sermons it is not necessary to say anything of the interesting matter which they contain, nor of the eloquence of many passages to be found in them. Perhaps the most remarkable are the sermons entitled "The Baptism of Suffering," "The Heavenly Uses of Earthly Adversity," and "The Kingdom of God." The opening sermon, which gives its name to the book, has also some passages of considerable eloquence. The title of Mr. Page Roberts's volume "carries with it no political connotation." In its author's view, liberalism in religion is Conservatism of religion," and the phrase which forms the title of the book is discussed in two thoughtful sermons. Mr. Page Roberts speaks and writes with a breadth of view which lends weight to his conclusions; and the memorial sermon on Frederick Denison Maurice, and the two chapters entitled "Commonplace Belief in God," and the one called "Means of Salvation," are among the most noteworthy sermons of a preacher who has always something worth hearing to say. We must also mention, in this connection, the yearly volume of Bampton Lectures. These sermons were preached in 1885 before the University of Oxford by Archdeacon Farrar, on the **History of Interpretation** (Macmillan). They display a great deal of erudition, and survey a large variety of topics. They deal with the

history of exegesis, rabbinical, Alexandrian, patristic, and scholastic ; with the Reformation, with the period that followed the Reformation, and with the growth of modern exegesis. Much theology and biography is interspersed. There are good descriptions of Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia. There is much width of view and considerable fairness displayed. The last lecture contains a eulogy of famous English preachers and divines, which is satisfactory to the patriotic student. Doctor Farrar skims the surfaces of much philosophy. Every one knows the resources of his rhetoric, and the volume contains ample evidence of his unusual command of long words. There are many passages of eloquence which many people will admire.

Mr. Maudsley's book upon **Natural Causes and Supernatural Seemings** (Kegan Paul) will interest the large class of people who occupy their minds with supernatural phenomena, and like to see the subject dealt with in a scientific way. Mr. Maudsley's volume is divided into three parts. The first deals with the "causes of fallacies incident to the natural operation of the sound mind ;" which again is subdivided into a consideration of "the natural defects and errors of human observation and reasoning," and an estimate of "the activity of imagination." The second part discusses the "causes which lie in the operations of the unsound mind," and treats of hallucinations and manias. The third part is mystically entitled "The Attainment of Supernatural Knowledge by Divine Illumination." After all this it is a little disappointing to be told at the end that the seeming phenomena of the supernatural have never been, nor ever are, events of the external world, but are merely fables of one's own imagination. A more philosophical treatment of perplexing problems may seem to some people to be attained by Vernon Lee, in the series of dialogues "On Views and Aspirations," which she has published under the title of **Baldwin** (Fisher Unwin). This writer possesses a fluency which threatens the reputation of Archdeacon Farrar, and there is much of interest in what she has to say. Baldwin, the hero of the dialogues, is a complacent, open-minded agnostic, whose own views are very properly and logically developed, but who, nevertheless, is quite willing to consider the views of his less fortunate friends. Among the other characters of the dialogues are three ladies, respectively a poet, a novelist, and a sentimental Theist ; a French critic, an Oxford undergraduate, and a well-drawn personage of the name of Rheinhardt. There is a generous catholicity in the subjects discussed, which include novels and vivisection, and theology and landscape art. Perhaps the most interesting dialogues are those entitled "The Value of an Ideal" and "The Responsibilities of Unbelief." Vernon Lee has considerable powers both of expression and of exposition ; her views are often original, and she always writes a very readable style.

As might have been expected, this year has produced several new works upon the history of Ireland. It is only natural that a year which has been signalised by the memorable proposals laid before Parliament for the better governing of Ireland should have been marked by the publication of many histories of Irish politics. Among these Mr. T. P. O'Connor's account of **The Parnell Movement** (Kegan Paul) takes the first place. Mr. O'Connor gives a clear sketch of the social condition and political fortunes of the country from the year 1843. He deals fully with the fall of O'Connell and the great famine of 1846. He has devoted a very long chapter to the "Great Clearances" which followed. But perhaps the most interesting parts of the book are those which recount the political vicissitudes of Ireland between the fall of O'Connell and the rise of Isaac Butt, and which chronicle

treachery of Keogh and Sadler, the resort to revolutionary methods, and final abandonment of the latter in favour of the constitutional agitation which has lent such strength to the movement for Home Rule. Afterwards O'Connor passes on to vindicate the policy of the Land League, and to sketch the events of the last few years, which are still fresh in the memory of

The book is full of bright, if rather too laudatory, sketches of Mr. O'Connor's political friends and associates. Side by side with this, but embracing a wider subject, stand the two volumes which Mr. O'Neill Daunt has called *Forty-five Years of Irish History* (Ward & Downey). They contain a very readable narrative of some phases of Irish history since the Union, with an abundance of anecdotes and quotations. They are throughout accurate, supported by considerable evidence, upon the Act of Union and its consequences in Ireland. The author dwells at some length upon the means and methods by which the Union was brought about, and the second volume is principally composed of an account of the Repeal Movement, and ends with an argument in favour of Home Rule. Two other small works have also been contributed to Irish history, one by the Hon. A. S. Canning, called *Revolted Ireland* (Allen), which deals chiefly with the rebellion of 1798; and the other, a very brief sketch of the Irish Parliament (Cassell), of which perhaps the most interesting chapters are those which describe the relations of the Irish Parliament to the English Parliament and the Privy Council, and the system of Irish administration. Lastly, we have a book, *The League of North and South* (Chapman & Hall), written by a man whom circumstances have to some extent divorced from the active party politics of Ireland, but who, in days when Irish patriotism was rarer, and when the fortunes of his countrymen were less auspicious than they are to-day, was foremost among those leaders of the Irish people whose real aims and motives Englishmen are at last beginning tardily to understand. Sir Charles Ivan Duffy's book is confessedly controversial—to this extent: It is dedicated to Mr. Justin McCarthy, partly as a reminder of the services which an earlier generation of politicians rendered to the Irish cause, and partly as a reproach for suffering these services to be too easily forgotten. The book is a history of the Tenant League, and of Irish politics generally between 1850 and 1854, full of life and full of keen interest, and recalls opportunely a time when Ulster men were not ashamed to unite heartily with the men of Conster and Munster and Connaught in furthering a movement for the benefit of the whole Irish people—an episode which, in the heat of recent controversies, has stood in danger of being overlooked.

Another book which is concerned with recent politics, and consequently, to a large extent, with Irish politics, is Mr. T. P. O'Connor's *Gladstone's Use of Commons* (Ward & Downey). This bulky volume is a series of sketches, often vivid and graphic, of the debates in the House of Commons, selected from daily contributions which Mr. O'Connor made to the newspapers between 1880 and 1885. It is impossible to feel that they are impartial; at times and in places they are markedly unjust to individuals. But, on the other hand, they are written by one who was a prominent actor in the scenes he narrates. They are picturesque, lifelike, and often brilliant; and they recall, with exceptional vividness, some of the most exciting episodes of recent Parliamentary life. All through, as the name of the book implies, they are dominated by "the overwhelming personality of Mr. Gladstone." We may perhaps mention, in this connection, a useful little handbook issued by Messrs. Barker & Daughlish, and published by Messrs. Chapman & Hall.

**The Historical and Political Handbook** contains, in very small compass, a complete record of the two Houses of Parliament. It gives the date and origin of every title, and a short account of the career and landed property of each peer; while the number of votes obtained at the last two elections by each candidate for the House of Commons is clearly and accurately stated. There are several useful appendices on various subjects. But perhaps the most interesting of recent Parliamentary records is to be found in the fascinating book which Mr. Grego has compiled under the title of **A History of Parliamentary Elections in the Old Days** (Chatto & Windus). This book is very pleasant reading, full of anecdotes and illustrations, and amusing little bits of political information, of squibs, ballads, and political songs. It is also a fairly complete picture of the electioneering of old days. The strictly historical aspects of the first chapter are not, perhaps, of great value, but all the matter which follows, from the picture of the electioneering struggles under Charles II., and Anne, and Walpole, down to the great days of the Wilkes controversies and of Parliamentary reform, is full of varied interest, with its confused, diverting chronicle of canvassing and polling, and chairing and election-feasting, and of "the all-prevailing bribery, turbulence, and intrigue." It would be very difficult to make such a subject dull.

Another political book, dealing with politics with a calmness and dispassionateness which is only too rare in recent political struggles, is Mr. Dicey's already famous volume, **England's Case against Home Rule** (Murray). Mr. Dicey's aim is "to criticise from a purely English point of view the policy of Home Rule, . . . and as a result of such criticism to establish the truth and develop the consequences of this proposition—namely, that any system of Home Rule . . . is less beneficial to Great Britain . . . than is the maintenance of the Union, and is at least as much opposed to the vital interests of England as would be the national independence of Ireland." The method which Mr. Dicey has followed is this. He first examines into "the causes which give strength to the Home Rule movement in England," and reviews the arguments used by English Home Rulers in its behalf. Then he states from an English point of view the advantages and disadvantages, both of maintaining the Union and of separating England and Ireland. Thirdly, he criticises all the plans of Home Rule which have been laid before the public. And lastly, he summarises the conclusions to which his arguments have brought him. Mr. Dicey's argument is not addressed to those who are in favour of total separation, but to the followers of Mr. Gladstone alone. He clearly distinguishes Home Rule from National Independence on the one hand, and from Local Self-Government on the other. He palters with no phrases, and permits no confusion of thought. He mercilessly and effectually sweeps away the cobwebs with which some politicians of weak nerve and shifty intellect have surrounded the simple proposition to establish in Ireland a subordinate Parliament with an executive responsible to it. To all parties Mr. Dicey's book is of great use and value. It is written in the highest tone. It discards rhetorical adjuncts and dialectical quibbles; and it despises the method of substituting personal insinuation and invective for fair argument and honourable debate. It is essentially academic; and therein lies both its weakness and its strength. No one will dispute Mr. Dicey's fair-mindedness, nor the impartiality with which he has stated the advantages of the policy which it is his aim to demolish. No one will quarrel with the method in which he proceeds to demolish that policy, nor with the method of his fifth and sixth chapters, and the pages which follow them. Perhaps a few will



be reluctant to echo his condemnation of the present system. But when all is said, both friends and foes will eulogise the argument which his book contains, and the friends will proceed to quote it, while the opinions of the foes will probably remain unchanged.

Another professor—Professor Laurie, of Edinburgh—comes forward with an interesting little book of lectures on **The Rise and Constitution of Universities** (Kegan Paul). The book is addressed not to “historical experts, but to schoolmasters and others who wish to know something about mediæval education and the rise of the universities.” Professor Laurie begins with a chapter upon the decline of the Romano-Hellenic schools, and goes on to consider carefully, in the next few chapters, the influence of Christianity upon education, especially under Charlemagne and the generations which followed his death. There is an interesting account of the rise of the Universities of Bologna and Paris, with a survey of the rights and duties of the students; and so we are brought down to the chapters which deal with the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge and Prague. Professor Laurie’s little book is very readable, and as instructive as it is full of interest. Some other glimpses of mediæval times are to be found in the brief history of London which Mr. Loftie has contributed to the series of **Historic Towns** (Longmans). Mr. Loftie’s small book deals chiefly with the early history of London, with its extent and its history and its municipal rights from the earliest times. He has a good deal of information to give, and sufficient topographical knowledge; but his historical researches are marred by too great condensation, combined with a lack of corroborating authorities, which render the volume disappointing.

The year has been filled with rumours of war in the East, and more than one new book has appeared describing the countries whose destinies make up the bewildering Eastern problem. Foremost among these books is Mr. Minchin’s **Growth of Freedom in the Balkan Peninsula** (Murray). Mr. Minchin is an observer who has travelled through the countries he writes of, who knows their leading men, who has had official connection with one at least of them, who can speak their language and understand their political vicissitudes, and who sympathises broadly and generously with their higher aims. Mr. Minchin, moreover, writes not only with knowledge, but with insight and with understanding. He gives a very bright account of the little principality among the mountains of Montenegro, which is not rendered the less valuable by the fact that the writer sees the foibles of the Montenegrins as clearly as he appreciates their virtues. Two chapters upon Bosnia follow, and no less than eight are devoted to Servia. There is a very interesting account of an interview which the author had with M. Tricoupis at Athens, including a discussion of most of the pressing political questions which are now agitating Greece. But the chief interest and the special charm of Mr. Minchin’s volume centre in the chapters upon Bulgaria, with their vivid sketches of Bulgarian life and politics, and above all with their stirring chronicle of the recent revolution, of Prince Alexander’s reign, of his troubles and dangers, of his abduction and deposition, of the counter-revolution at Philippopolis, and of the Prince’s return and abdication in favour of the Regents. Those who desire to study Bulgarian history and politics in the pages of a writer whose opportunities have been as wide as his sympathies, and his success in turning them to account as wide as both, cannot do better than read Mr. Minchin’s book. Stepniak’s account of Russia is a book written, though in a very different manner, very much with the same

object, and on the same method, as Mr. Minchin's account of Bulgaria. **The Russian Storm-cloud** (Sonnenschein) is practically a series of papers upon Russia which have appeared in magazines at different times, altered, reproduced, and considerably added to. The first four chapters, which deal with the Russian revolutionary forces, and which contain, among much that is visionary and problematical, much earnest and eloquent writing, and a good deal of useful information, are reprints of articles previously published in *Time*. There is a chapter on "The Russian Army," and another upon "Terrorism in Russia," both of which, if true, are very significant. At any rate, the author believes not only in the virtue, but in the nearness of revolution in Russia; and it is not consoling to read that Russian revolution "appears to many minds as a threatening phantom of general destruction, . . . scarcely less dangerous to the peace of Europe than to the despotism of the Tzar." The book is eminently political, but is also useful and interesting. The third book which we wish to mention in this connection is Mr. Tucker's account of **Life and Society in Eastern Europe** (Sampson Low). Hungary is a country which has long been little known to the rest of Europe, and Mr. Tucker's book has therefore a use almost independently of its own merits. It is a readable volume, with plenty of stories and plenty of gossip of Magyar manners and hospitality. There is also a great deal of useful information about the various races who make up the population of Transylvania. In Hungary and Transylvania, as in other countries more tolerant or at least less loudly complaining, the extraordinary increase in the Jewish race threatens to assume the dimensions of a national problem.

It is gratifying to be so frequently reminded of a fact which none but the mentally paralysed stand in any danger of forgetting—that her Majesty has attained the fiftieth year of her reign. This happy circumstance seems to have reflected itself by anticipation in the literature of the year. The celebration of a jubilee of course lends an undeniable impetus to the imperialism which is coming into vogue, and affords a specially appropriate opportunity for reminiscences of the character and characteristics of the empire we possess. In view of this fact travellers and writers have largely confined their voyages abroad to lands within the limits of the British Empire, and the result is that the books of travel of the year offer patriotic attractions of peculiar value. First among them stands a book which has not only already become famous, but of which it is said that the fame has already begun to pass away. Mr. Froude's **Oceana** (Longmans) has all the charm of style which is inseparable from Mr. Froude's writings. It is an account of a tour recently undertaken by its author through the colonial dominions of Great Britain. It is unnecessary to say that wherever Mr. Froude went he was received and welcomed as an honoured guest, that the leading men in each colony vied with one another in the endeavour to make his stay attractive to him, and naturally expected him to bear away the impress of their views. Mr. Froude evidently had a delightful tour, and no pains were spared to make the colonies a pleasant sojourning-place for him. It was his object avowedly to meet men as well as to visit countries, in order to form views upon the question of Imperial Federation, which is the animating principle of his book. We may also assume that people in the colonies were very ready to give him any information he sought. The first country visited by Mr. Froude was the Cape Colony, of which he had already had considerable experience, but of the destinies of which he is inclined to

like a pessimistic view. From South Africa Mr. Froude sailed for Adelaide, where every one seems occupied, and every one at least moderately contented ;" but after a short day's stay there he hurried on to Melbourne. To the gardens of Melbourne, as to those of Ballarat and Sydney, Mr. Froude does full justice, writing with enthusiasm of their beauty and fertility, but to Adelaide among Australian cities Mr. Froude awards the palm. At Sydney he had an interesting interview with Mr. Dalley, to whom is due the initiation of the policy which resulted in the despatch of Australian troops to the Sudan ; and he afterwards paid a visit to the Governor at Moss Vale. From Australia Mr. Froude passed on to New Zealand, and several chapters are devoted to the description of that colony, and especially to the personality of Sir George Grey. It is perhaps only fair to say in this connection that Mr. Froude's somewhat depreciatory judgments on New Zealand have excited bitter disappointment in the colony, and that his facts have been assailed, if not utterly shattered, by subsequent writers, whose knowledge of the subject is necessarily much greater than Mr. Froude's. A few chapters occupied with American sketches bring the book to a close, and one shuts it almost with a sense of relief, for in places its pessimism is as prominent as its brilliant style and its vivid interest. Every reader will do well to read Mr. Froude's book, but he will also do well to remember, in reading it, that the attacks it has provoked—on matters not of policy, but of fact—have been very numerous, and that Mr. Froude's assertions can scarcely be thought to hold the field.

A much smaller book, with a less ambitious purpose, is Mr. Salmon's **Crown Colonies of Great Britain** (Cassell), which is by no means an account of a holiday tour, but that far more serious matter, "an inquiry into the social condition and methods of administration" of the colonies mentioned. This little book is full of facts and figures, and full also of very useful information. Of course it is mainly occupied by matters relating to the West Indies, and one of the best of its chapters is a chapter on the social condition of those colonies. Perhaps it is a little overweighted by statistics, but that is almost necessary if it is to fulfil its aim. But the most valuable book upon the subject of our possessions abroad has been written by a foreigner. Baron von Hübner, who is as experienced as a traveller as he is accomplished as a diplomatist, has supplemented his journeys in the Northern Hemisphere by an equally well-told journey chiefly in the southern quarters of the world. The route chosen by the author for his travels **Through the British Empire** (Murray) was from Southampton to South Africa by a Union steamer, thence by the Orient line to Melbourne, and on to New Zealand, which he traversed from south to north. At Nelson and New Plymouth Baron von Hübner was able to accompany the Governor on his official tour, and the knowledge he gained from him, and from the Ministers of the country, enables him to form judgments of New Zealand which are likely to be received with less protest than those of Mr. Froude. From Auckland, *via* Sydney and Brisbane, the author successively visited Java, Singapore, and Ceylon, and thence he proceeded to make a long tour through the presidencies of the Indian Empire, ultimately returning to Ceylon. Another visit to Sydney followed, and thence the baron sailed through the West Pacific islands, touching at Honolulu on his way, and, crossing the States by the North Pacific line, obtained a brief glimpse of Canada, but only just sufficient to justify the title of his book. It is unnecessary to say that Baron von Hübner's volumes are full of interest, and abound in

judgments both entertaining and discriminating upon policies and men and things.

This year another kingdom has been added to our empire in the East, and two interesting books have appeared on the subject. Mr. Scott's method, in the volume which he entitles **Burma, as it Was, as it Is, and as it Will Be** (Redway), has been to begin with a sketch of the history of Burma, from the early native legends down to the recent British conquest. This sketch is followed by a geographical description of Upper and Lower Burma, which is of considerable value to those who know little of the country. But the most interesting part of the volume is the account which Mr. Scott gives of the kings, the officials, and the habits and characteristics of the people, and the information he has to offer about the hill tribes of the frontier provinces. Mr. Geary's volume, **Burma, after the Conquest, viewed in its Political, Social, and Commercial Aspects from Mandalay** (Sampson Low), is of a different kind. It is the work of a writer profoundly versed in experiences and knowledge of the East, and the information which it gives, especially in the latter half of the volume, as to the difficulties which beset, and are likely to beset, our administration in the country, is based on a wide acquaintance with Burmese habits, and of real value to any one interested in the problem of Burmese government. We must class with these two works Mr. Edwin Arnold's bright account of his visit to India. **India Revisited** (Trübner) is of course a most readable book. Mr. Arnold describes his voyage by the *Parramatta* to Suez, to Perim, to Bombay, and his journey thence to Tanna and Poona. A chapter is given to the nautch dances and plays, and another chapter describes the "model native state" of Bhaonagar, where Mr. Arnold was entertained with princely hospitality. There is a very picturesque description of Ahmedabad, and of Rajputana with its haughty "immemorial houses," and thence Mr. Arnold passes on to speak of Delhi and Agra and Madras. There is also a good chapter devoted to Ceylon. The book is full of illustrations and of short bits of poetry, which lend it an additional attraction that is welcome, though by no means needed. The last book to be noticed in this connection is Mr. Frank Hatton's account of **North Borneo** (Sampson Low), which his father has edited, and to which Sir Walter Medhurst has written a preface. This book contains the notes and observations, together with some of the diaries and other papers and writings, of a young and very promising explorer, who was appointed to examine the mineral resources of North Borneo, and who, after only eighteen months' residence in the country, was killed by a sad accident not long ago. Mr. Hatton has published letters and reminiscences from private friends, with notices of the writers and the official records of the catastrophe, which bear ample testimony to the opinion that obtained of his son's worth. Of course much of the information contained in the book is chiefly of local interest, but there are several passages illustrative of the customs of the country, and some useful topographical knowledge. A few slight sketches and illustrations are scattered through the book.

If North America is no longer a British possession, the history of its people is so much bound up with the history of the British Empire as to justify a notice of it in Jubilee year. Mr. Doyle's account of **The English in America** (Longmans) is practically a continuation of a former work, though it comes out in an independent form. Mr. Doyle's two volumes are serious and bulky. They begin with an account of "The Plymouth Pilgrims," and of the first emigrant schemes of the early seventeenth century, and this is

owed by a sketch of the settlement of Massachusetts. Mr. Doyle then sees the rise of the colony, its extension to the North and South, and the dual union of the settlements in the New England Confederation. The last chapter of the first volume is occupied with a sketch of the Confederation's history under the Commonwealth, with an estimate of the results it produced by the political vicissitudes in England. The second of the two volumes opens with an interesting survey of the civilisation of New England in the middle of the seventeenth century, and then goes on to relate the political fortunes of the colony during the generation that followed, giving a very full description of the governorships of Phipps and of Dudley, and bringing the history of the New England settlement down to the opening year of the eighteenth century. Mr. Doyle justifies and elucidates his laborious work with appendices, notes, and maps.

Another book on India appears upon our list. Captain Trotter's history **India under Victoria** (Allen) is a very readable book, and it is, moreover, a very useful and comprehensive survey of Indian history during nearly half a century. The first volume, which from the nature of its subject is perhaps the more interesting of the two, deals with the first Afghan war, the two Sikh wars, and the conquest of the Punjaub, with the administration of Lord Dalhousie, "the great proconsul," and gradually brings us on to the siege and capture of Delhi, terminating with a glowing eulogy on Lord Lawrence, whom the author regards as the real deliverer of India from the Mutiny. The second volume is necessarily the less varied in its interests of the two, but the history of the end of the Mutiny, and the chapters on the administrations of Lords Lawrence, Mayo, and Northbrook, are especially good. The author closes his work with a sketch of the second Afghan war. Many histories of India have been written, but Captain Trotter's deserves a high place among them.

It is perhaps well to be reminded that there are other colonial empires in the world besides our own, and from this point of view considerable interest attaches to Mr. Norman's volume on **Colonial France** (Allen). It is a very clear and instructive account of French colonisation, from the gallant labours of Colbert to found a French empire beyond the seas down to more recent exploits of our neighbours in Madagascar, Tunis, and elsewhere. The book is interestingly written, and of real historical and political value. It is illustrated by a capital map.

Miss Gordon-Cumming is an indefatigable traveller, who always is able to render a very good account of the journeys which she takes. The two volumes of her **Wanderings in China** (Blackwood) are the account of her experiences of a practised observer and very competent critic. Miss Gordon-Cumming began her wanderings by a visit to Hong Kong, her estimate of which is very complimentary, and while there she witnessed one of the terrible fires which so often devastate the wood-built towns of China. A comparatively long stay in Canton enabled the author to gain an intimate knowledge of the sights and wonders of that city, and was followed by short visits to Swatow and Amoy. The description of Foochow is as unfavourable to the people as it is favourable to the natural beauty of the place, and Miss Gordon-Cumming has sad tales to tell of the disposition of the inhabitants. From Foochow Miss Gordon-Cumming went on to Ningpo, Shanghai, Chefoo, Tsin, and Peking, and the accounts she gives of all these places, of their active features, of their demerits, and of their attractions, is full of interest, and not wanting in valuable instruction.



A very different account of another great empire comes from the pen of Mr. Baring-Gould. Indeed, his account of **Germany**, contributed to Messrs. Unwin's series of the **Story of the Nations**, is more properly a history than anything else. It professes, of course, to be a history told in the popular style, very succinct, very readable, very simple, though not without an affectation of simplicity, full of stories, and legends, and picturesque episodes interwoven with a clear and attractive narrative of events. Mr. Baring-Gould and his coadjutor, Mr. Gilman, have surveyed in a very small compass a vast period of history, from the days of Marius to the days of the last Franco-German war, keeping in sight of course only the great dramatic features of the period, and purposely leaving details out of sight; and they have made a very popular little volume more popular still by inserting a large number of excellent illustrations drawn from old pictures, manuscripts, and missals.

Two books of travels by sea must find mention in our list. **Cannibals and Convicts** (Cassell) is the alliterative but not inexpressive title given by that enterprising journalist, Mr. Julian Thomas, to his experiences and explorations in the Western Pacific. Let us at once confess that it too has an imperialistic object, and that from sundry references to the Greater Britain beyond the seas it appears that Mr. Thomas is not forgetful of Jubilee year. Apart from that the book has independent interest as a brightly written account of countries little known even in these days. Mr. Thomas is the only journalist who has visited New Caledonia, the Isle of Pines, and the New Hebrides, and he has turned his experiences to good account. It is an open question whether he is more intimate with cannibals or with convicts, but his description of both classes is full of information and of interest. Mr. Thomas naturally devotes a good deal of space to a description of the convict settlements, and to the pressing question of French policy and conduct in West Pacific waters; and though there is a great deal well worth reading told us of the countries visited and their native inhabitants, the chief interest of the book centres in its discussion of topics which are more or less nearly connected with Australian politics of the present day. The other book we mentioned is Major Greely's narrative of **Three Years of Arctic Service** (Bentley), which, though perhaps its episodes are no longer new to the public, is among the most exciting of explorers' tales. These two volumes have no pretensions to the character of a scientific report, although the plants which were saved are catalogued in an appendix, and though there is much useful information given about the ethnology and the animals of the North. Major Greely's tone is modest in the extreme; sometimes he seems nervously afraid of being thought to exaggerate. But the story which he has to tell is one that needs no exaggeration. The whole narrative of that now famous expedition, of the start and voyage, and of the members of the party, of the troublesome disposition of some, and of the mutiny of others, of the life at Fort Conger, of the explorations in Greenland and in the interior of Grinnell Land by men who reached the farthest point north ever yet recorded to have been reached by man, of the retreat south, of the famine of the last few weeks, of the frightful winter at Bedford Pim Island off Cape Sabine, and of all the sufferings and errors, and loyalty and courage, which have rendered memorable the fortunes of Major Greely and his men, is told simply and fully and frankly, as only the chief actor in the scenes related could have told it, and is as full of interest as it is of dramatic events.

Three new volumes have been added to **The Bodminston Library**

ngmans). The Earl of Suffolk and Mr. Craven, assisted by the Hon. F. Wey, have written a history of racing, both in old days and in later times. The chapters which deal with modern racing are, of course, full of anecdotes and personal stories, and contain a great deal of information, given by writers who know well the subjects on which they write, upon three-year-olds, and trainers, and jockeys, and betting. The latter half of this volume is occupied with an account of steeplechasing, contributed by Mr. Watson and Mr. Arthur Coventry. Two other volumes are devoted to the wider subject of shooting, in "field and covert" and in "moor and marsh." For these volumes Lord Walsingham, Lord Lovat, Sir Ralph Payne-Galwey, and several other contributors share the responsibility and the credit. The science of shooting is explained, and there is a great deal of information about guns and their making; while every department of shooting, from partridge-shooting and rabbit-shooting to deer-stalking and wildfowl-shooting, is amply and carefully reviewed and explained.

The poetry of the year is once more rendered memorable by a new volume from the Laureate. **Locksley Hall Sixty Years After** (Macmillan) is not unworthy of the great reputation it has to sustain. And yet it is undoubtedly melancholy in tone. The reflections of an old man who sees the ideals of his youth unaccomplished, and the finest ambitions of his early days unrealised and shattered, can scarcely fail to be sad. It is impossible to help feeling that Tennyson—it is the name and not the peerage that is of consequence—means to bring an indictment against the failure of the age to perform the tasks which it set itself two generations ago. Of course, the promise of a very hopeful era has not been carried out. To some extent the indictment is true. Those that aim the highest often fail to attain all they aim at. And yet they deserve the credit of aiming very high. It is not to be denied that there is, in the natural order of events, some truth in what the poet complains. Perhaps this generation has proved itself a generation of—

"Evolution ever climbing after some ideal good,  
And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the mud."

Those who think of the condition of our great cities cannot deny that—

"There among the glooming alleys Progress halts on palsied feet."

Those who have shared the great hopes and noble patriotism of the author of **Locksley Hall** will be the first to admit that all those hopes have not been accomplished. But, while rejoicing in the musical old cadences and the magical power of playing with words which that author still retains, they will see that if much of their dream has failed of realisation, much of it has been brought to completion and been fruitful of good results, and they will hesitate before they echo the resonant, melancholy lines—

"Poor old voice of eighty crying after voices that have fled!  
All I loved are vanish'd voices, all my steps are on the dead."

"All the world is ghost to me, and as the phantom disappears,  
Forward far and far from here is all the hope of eighty years."

The two short poems that follow, "The Fleet," and the poem on the "Opening of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition by the Queen," are occupied with the subject of Imperialism, and the floating thoughts of federation which it suggests. Of course, they are not wanting in stirring and memorable lines.

The latter part—indeed, the greater part—of the little volume is devoted to "The Promise of May," a drama not much different in quality from other dramas of the Laureate's, with a great deal of rustic dialogue, which is true, perhaps, but scarcely very attractive, and with a picture of a freethinking but unworthy hero, which we are inclined to hope will be found neither attractive nor true. On this drama, which stands in a very different position from the other poems in the volume, the public has already pronounced a verdict which it is not likely to recall.

**Cycia** (Kegan Paul) is a drama of a different kind. It was written, Mr. Lewis Morris tells us, "with a view to stage representation, and it is therefore rather as an acting play than as a dramatic poem that it should be judged." It is a play in five acts, founded on a story by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the story of a woman who sacrifices herself and her husband in order to save her native country, which her husband was conspiring to ruin. This main plot is somewhat marred by a second plot which accompanies and interrupts it, in which both the hero and heroine are made the victims of jealousy and misunderstanding. But the play contains many passages of vigour and lines of poetic merit not unworthy of the reputation of Mr. Lewis Morris. Two other small volumes may be mentioned in this connection, **A Modern Ideal** (Kegan Paul), by Sidney Royce Lysaght, and **Lays and Legends** (Longmans), by E. Nesbit. The first of these two books is a dramatic poem in a variety of metres, which attempts to deal boldly with the conditions and conventions of modern society. At the same time it includes passages, soliloquies of a pilgrim by a ruined abbey and the like, which can scarcely be held to be characteristic of modern times. "At the risk of the charge of vulgarity, the colloquial language of low life has been introduced in one or two scenes," and "an endeavour is also made to indicate the individualities of different characters by different metres." Still, in spite of many things that strike one as fantastic, there is much in this little volume which will repay the reader. "Lays and Legends," if more commonplace, will be found by most people more readable and attractive. There are some very charming lyrics in the book, and many poems in this small collection, especially those called "The Moat House," "Two Voices," and "Christmas Eve," which perhaps stand first among many others nearly as attractive, are both in form and in matter an addition to our store of graceful English verse.

Among the more noteworthy volumes of poetry of the year we must mention two volumes which stand high among them—Mr. Coventry Patmore's **Poems** (Bell). They are practically a reprint of Mr. Patmore's collected poetical works. Mr. Patmore is scrupulous and severe as a reviser of his own poems, a fact which lends a special value to a final edition of his works. We have here a conclusive text of the "Angel in the House," and what we may regard as the authorised form of Mr. Patmore's poems. Most of them are well known already, and have appeared before. Mr. Patmore's theme, above all others, is the theme of falling in love. He is both a visionary mystic and a graceful chronicler of comparatively humdrum life. It is difficult to appreciate properly a poet of so many moods, each of which seems at times exactly to fit in with one's own. From the very early verses written, as Mr. Patmore tells us, at sixteen, to the fine octosyllabics called "The Three Witnesses," printed here for the first time, through a long series of poems, including "King Cophetua the First" and "Deliciæ Sapientie de Amore," there runs the same varying strain of graceful verse, which

evertheless, never quite the same except in the ease and facility with which it finds expression. And lastly, we have a little book of poems by Mrs. Jean Leaux, entitled **Philip Molesworth** (Sampson Low). The poem which gives its name to the book is a narrative blank-verse poem in six parts, which occupies half the volume. The rest is filled by sonnets and short miscellaneous poems and fragments, many of which are graceful and melodious, and wanting in passages of merit.

A different type of book is to be found in Mr. Wollaston's **Half-hours with Muhammad** (Allen). It professes to be a "popular account of the origin of Islam," and was suggested, the author tells us, by the opening of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. However remote the connection may seem to many minds between the origins of the creed of the Koran and the recent effective bazaar at South Kensington, no one will deny that Mr. Wollaston has produced a brief and sufficiently readable narrative of the foundation and subsequent fortunes of the Mohammedan Empire and faith. The work has no pretensions to be original, but it will be found to contain an interesting matter.

Mr. Swinburne is a critic as well as a poet, and the volume of **Miscellaneous Essays** (Chatto & Windus) which he has published is full of real critical insight as well as of brilliant rhetoric. The first essay deals largely with Mr. John Addington Symonds's "Lives of Famous Poets," a book of which Mr. Swinburne has a high estimate, and which perhaps has never had justice done to it. Again, the monograph from the "Encyclopædia Britannica" on Mary Stuart characterised by even stronger marks of insight, information, and judgment. Poets who love the memory of Mary Stuart will readily admit that Mr. Swinburne must be sensible of the charm and glamour which still attach to her name; and the emphatic, unsparing condemnation of Mary's falseness, selfishness, and cowardice which Mr. Swinburne pronounces will therefore carry additional weight. The volume is full of variety. There are judgments on Chaucer, on Spenser, on Shakespeare, on Dryden and Congreve, on Collins and Landor and Milton and Keats, on Byron and Tennyson and Musset, and on others gifted in other ways. To fiction Mr. Swinburne devotes a considerable part of his book, and he always writes on this subject with the authority of ample knowledge and understanding. His essay on Emily Brontë is full of passages which may rank among the best of his critical work. Charles Reade's place in fiction is probably scarcely yet fixed, but Mr. Swinburne does full justice to his strength and power, and rightly places him in a very high place; and his other criticisms on fiction, on Scott, on Dickens, and on the American school, are full of thought. But perhaps the most remarkable essay is the one wherein Mr. Swinburne steps down to battle with Mr. Matthew Arnold, as he has often done before, to drag down Byron from the pedestal on which Mr. Arnold has set him, and to estimate the value of the genius of Wordsworth. Some of Mr. Swinburne's regularly appreciative criticisms upon the latter are in his very best style.

Two pleasant little volumes of letters well deserve mention, widely as they differ in purpose and style. Mr. Williams has edited, with notes, a volume which professes to be the "first series" of a collection of eighteenth-century letters. If the subsequent volumes of **English Letters and Letter-writers of the Eighteenth Century** (Bell) fulfil the promise of their title, they will be a welcome addition to our rich stores of eighteenth-century literature. At the same time it is to be hoped that the manner in which they are edited

will be altered and improved. The letters of Pope and Swift are so full of interest as to make any book attractive which deals with them; but the blunders and inaccuracies of the editor go far to destroy the value of what might be a very useful as well as a very readable volume. Mr. Andrew Lang's **Letters to Dead Authors** (Longmans) are a series of twenty-two letters written to some of the great writers of past generations, commenting upon their works and reputations in a style that often becomes an exceedingly happy imitation of their own.

Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole has brought out a handsome volume upon **The Art of the Saracens in Egypt** (Chapman & Hall). Mr. Lane-Poole deals of course with what is commonly known as "Arab" or "Mohammedan" art, but he rejects those misleading titles for the more general term "Saracenic," which "means simply Eastern, and was the universal designation of Muslims in the Middle Ages." The volume before us treats only of the Egyptian branch of the Saracenic art, "with but occasional passing glances at contemporary or derived developments," a branch of art which is best illustrated by the characteristic mosques of Cairo. The first chapter of Mr. Lane-Poole's work is occupied with a sketch of the history of the Saracens in Egypt, which is admirable as an introduction to the subject; and from that the author passes on to describe the various departments of the Saracenic art. There is an interesting chapter under the broad head of "Architecture," and this is followed by some ten chapters devoted to such special subjects as "Mosaic," "Metal-work," "Glass," "Pottery," and so forth. Every department of the subject is carefully and separately treated, from the woodwork of the pulpits of the mosques to the textile fabrics of Iconium and the illuminated manuscripts of the Koran. Mr. Lane-Poole has trodden a field which is almost unexplored, and the results of his wide information are given in an admirable form. Some hundred woodcuts serve to illustrate and to explain the text.

Another work full of art and archæology is Mr. Henry Middleton's **Ancient Rome in 1885** (Black). Mr. Middleton has so much to say that is new, and he is so well able to summarise what has been said before, that he is amply justified in adding a new book to the many books that have already been written on the subject. The first chapter of Mr. Middleton's book gives an admirable account of the Roman architectural style of building and the Roman methods of construction. The architecture, painting, and sculpture of the early Romans appear to have been "an ingenious compound of these arts as practised in Greece, Assyria, and Egypt." The author's opinion on the use of stucco by the Romans, his remarks on the Basilica of Constantine and the Pantheon, the interpretations and illustrations of Vitruvius which he occasionally introduces, the catalogue given of decorative marbles used at Rome, and especially his observations upon the discovery of a large Etruscan necropolis on the Esquiline, are among the most interesting features of the first part of the book. But its greatest merits are perhaps to be found in the account, the ample, careful, and critical account, which Mr. Middleton gives in his fifth and sixth chapters of the recent excavations in the Forum, of Roman concrete and wall-painting, of the real history of the rostra built by Julius Cæsar at the west end of the Temple of Julius Cæsar, of the great Temple of Jupiter, of the reliefs of Trajan, and of the other great buildings in the Forum and its neighbourhood; and the pages in which he describes the house of the vestal virgins, and the recent discoveries which have been made there, are perhaps the most valuable



ortion of the book. Mr. Middleton completes his volumes with some excellent illustrations and plans.

We notice with pleasure the appearance of the continuation of Dr. Woltmann's **History of Painting** (Kegan Paul). This work, which is designed to be the most comprehensive history of the subject ever written, is characterised throughout by the thoroughness and exhaustive research which we have learned to associate with German criticism. Mrs. Bell's translation displays both skill and judgment, and, while scrupulous to preserve intact the statements of its author, she has not hesitated, where she has thought it necessary or expedient, to introduce an occasional transposition or abridgment. Mr. Woermann has undertaken, and successfully accomplished, the task of turning to account the great mass of material which the late Dr. Voltmann bequeathed to him at his death; and he has done his work in a manner worthy of the trust imposed upon him. He has presented us with a history of painting which promises to be final, traced carefully and laboriously downward, and amplified by explanation and illustration from the early days when painting had its origin in the arts of Egypt and the East.

We are glad to welcome a second edition of so standard a work as Professor Ferrier's **Functions of the Brain** (Smith & Elder). "The book has been almost entirely rewritten; a good deal has been added," and several modifications have been introduced. But the chief doctrines advocated by Dr. Ferrier, with regard to the "localisation of cerebral functions, are maintained in all essentials unchanged." It is the work of a man who is qualified to speak on the subject with an authority which few possess, based upon the author's personal experiments on the functions of the brain. It has been Dr. Ferrier's object to give a "concise digest" of the various researches into the subject, in order to render intelligible the exposition of the bearing of his own experiments, and to survey the functions of the brain and central nervous system, in accordance with the best established facts of recent pathological and physiological inquiry. In such a work each chapter is a separate step in the development of the subject, and it is consequently difficult to single any one out for special mention; but the pages which discuss the "functions of the cerebellum," and those occupied with a study of "the hemispheres considered psychologically," will, perhaps, be thought to contain some of the most interesting passages in the book. The illustrations are both necessary and successful. Another book of science of a different kind is Professor Milnes Marshall's **Practical Zoology** (Smith & Elder). It has no pretensions to be a standard work. On the title-page it modestly calls itself "a junior course," and the animals described are those, the writer tells us, which are generally selected as typical studies for a junior laboratory course. It aims at being a manual for those who "desire to obtain a practical acquaintance with the elements of animal morphology," and it has more than attained its aim. Professor Marshall has made his book as practical as he could. He gives us chapters on Protozoa, on the earthworm, the crayfish, the cockroach, the skeleton of the rabbit, and the skeleton of the fowl; and he combines with them advice upon the dissection of fish and fowls which will be of keen interest to the student, but which is not intended to inspire the general public with enthusiasm. Some well-chosen illustrations help to elucidate what will doubtless prove a very useful book.

## ART, DRAMA, AND MUSIC.

## I. THE FINE ARTS.

**The National Gallery.**—In conformity with the recognised rule that liberal expenditure in one year must be followed by long periods of economy, a very small portion of the ordinary grant of Parliament (5,000*l.*) for the purchase of pictures was spent in the course of 1886. Happily, the trustees have at their disposal other special sources of income whence funds are forthcoming where, as during the past year, to find the means of purchasing suitable works. Of such funds the Clarke Bequest furnished the means for purchasing at the Dudley sale a panel work, "The Israelites Gathering Manna," by Ercole Giulio de Roberto; and out of the Walker Fund were purchased at the Graham sale the "Vagrants," by F. Walker, A.R.A. (1,770 guineas); "Ecce Ancilla Domini," by D. G. Rossetti (800 guineas); two panels by Morone; a portrait of Girolamo Malatini, by G. Bellini; the "Meeting of Coriolanus and Volumnia," by Michele da Verona, and two panels by Francesco Ubertini (Il Bacchiacca); and a "Virgin and Child," by Andrea di Luigi d'Assisi; out of the Wheeler bequest was purchased a fine landscape of the valley of the Yare, by James Stark (400*l.*), and from other sources a "Madonna and Child," by Bonifazio the elder; a similar subject by Giovanni Busi Cariani; and a "Dutch Interior," by A. de Pope (252*l.*) Foremost amongst the other acquisitions by the National Gallery was Constable's "Hay Wain," presented by Mr. J. Vaughan; three fragments of a fresco by Spinello Aretino, presented by Sir H. A. Layard; and a landscape by F. L. Bredell, "The Chestnut Woods about Varenna," presented by Mrs. Bredell Fox. Amongst the bequests were: "Virgin and Child," by Domenico Veneziano, from the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres; a landscape by Salvator Rosa, from Mrs. F. L. Richetts; and a number of studies of animal and plant life by Otho Marcellis, from Mr. J. Whitworth Shaw.

The progress made during the year in extending the existing accommodation for pictures has been highly satisfactory; but some time must elapse before the works are completed (involving an outlay of 60,000*l.*), and the new galleries made available for hanging the numerous oil pictures for which space is required. Meanwhile, on the ground floor three small rooms have been set aside for the exhibition of water-colour paintings by Turner, De Wint, and Cattermole; and for a small collection of monochrome drawings by Rubens and Van Dych, which passed into the possession of the trustees in the purchase of the Peel collection.

**The British Museum.**—No further additions were made to the buildings during the year, the whole of the Parliamentary grant for such purposes being expended on sanitary works and protection against fire. Considerable changes, however, were made in the rearrangement of the collections, especially of the prints and drawings. Of these, a small but complete exhibition, illustrative of the history of the art of engraving, was arranged by the keeper, Mr. Sidney Colvin, and opened to the public during the summer months.

**The National Portrait Gallery**, removed to the Bethnal Green Museum in the course of the previous year, seems destined to remain at the East End for an indefinite period. In reply to an inquiry from the Chairman of the trustees (Viscount Hardinge) addressed in the House of Lords to the Chief Commissioner of Works, it was stated (May 21) that nothing definite had been settled with regard to the new site; and no vote was taken either for its purchase or for the erection of a new building on ground already in the possession of the Government. Out of the special grant of 1,500*l.* made for the purchase of portraits at the Blenheim sale, only 680*l.* was expended on a picture by Gainsborough of John Russell, fourth Duke of Bedford; whilst out of the ordinary Parliamentary grant the purchases made were for portraits of General Sir Thomas and Lady Fairfax (162*l.* 15*s.*), R. Walker (26*l.* 5*s.*), and Thomas Betterton (26*l.* 5*s.*)

**South Kensington Museum.**—Although no addition has been made to the building during the year, some progress has been effected towards the completion of the internal decoration. Of such work Sir F. Leighton's fresco "The Arts of Peace" was the most important; and the final portion was unveiled in the course of the autumn. For this work Sir F. Leighton was paid 8,000*l.* as stipulated. The south-east courts were provided with tiled floors, the ceiling of the corridor was decorated, and iron gates were provided for the west entrance.

The Museum of Casts having been filled as far as the present limits of its sphere will permit, the Director of Art (Mr. T. Armstrong) has occupied himself during the year with reproductions in electrotype, plaster, &c. specimens of antique gold and silver plate from various Danish palaces; castings of the "Seated Memory" and "Sappho," from the Museo Nazionale at Naples; casts of figures, friezes, &c. from various cathedrals, public buildings, &c. in France, Germany, and Italy, have been obtained in order to show fully the history of art in foreign countries, its gradual development and general relationship.

Among the acquisitions of the year, the following are the most noteworthy:—

Purchases exceeding 100*l.* in the year 1886:—Two stone doorways, carved in low relief, from the interior of the ducal palace at Gubbio, erected by Federigo, Duke of Urbino, K.G.; Italian; about 1475–80; 450*l.* Doorway, stone, pietra serena, carved in low relief; from the same source, with the badge of the Order of the Garter introduced into the frieze, 150*l.* Folding doors, a pair; Tarsia or inlaid work of light and dark woods; from the same palace; 200*l.* Lord Mostyn's salt cellar, with cover; silver-gilt; cylindrical; repoussé with strapwork panels and fruit, among which occur masks, birds, and animals; it rests on three ball and claw feet; the cover rises in three graduated tiers of repoussé ornament, surmounted by a kind of vase crowned by an acorn; English; hall-mark for 1586–7. This magnificent specimen of early English work was purchased, together with three smaller salt cellars (1568–78) and a pepper castor, for 2,100*l.* Porcelain vase; four-sided, the base incurved, the body first swelling upwards and then narrowing towards the neck, which is widest at the mouth; the sides are painted in enamel colours with flowering trees &c. on black ground, the foot and neck with similar ornament on a light green ground; old Chinese; 140*l.* Silver ectoral cross, in two parts, forming a reliquary encrusted with translucent enamel in gold cloisons on a gold ground; on one part is represented the *aviour on the cross with the busts of the Virgin and St. John*; on

other part is a full-length figure of the Virgin, together with busts of SS. John Baptist, Paul, Peter, and Andrew; Byzantine; 10th or 11th century; 815*l*. Columns (four); wood with circular shafts swelling upwards, and squared capitals widest at the top; carved diversely with human figures intermingled with birds and animals, fruit and foliage; the circular sockets carved with foliage, and resting on square bases, are modern substitutes for the crouching lions which originally supported the columns, and of which only two have been secured for the Museum; these columns formerly supported an organ; South Italian; 13th (?) century; 207*l*. 6*s*.

From the Orrock Collection:—Jar with cover; porcelain, painted with the so-called "Hawthorn pattern" in white on a blue ground; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 230*l*. Bottles (a pair); porcelain, with bulbous body and long neck, painted in blue within white panels, some lobed, others fruit-shape, with monsters among waves, rabbits, crayfish, and flowers; the rest of the surface is mottled blue; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 126*l*. 10*s*. Jar with cover; porcelain, painted with the so-called "Hawthorn pattern" in white on a deep blue ground; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 883*l*. 6*s*. 8*d*. Jars with covers (a pair); porcelain, painted with the so-called "Hawthorn pattern" in white on a blue ground; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 460*l*. Jars (a pair); porcelain, with elongated body and wide mouth, painted in blue with groups of ladies and vases of flowering trees in alternate panels; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 168*l*. 13*s*. 4*d*. Vases (a pair); porcelain, trumpet-shape, painted in blue with vases and symbols, flowers and birds in panels; trellis ornament around the mouth and foot; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 153*l*. 6*s*. 8*d*. Vases (three); porcelain, cylindrical, painted in blue on white panels of various shapes, with landscapes, vases of flowers, horses rushing over waves, deer under trees; period of the Ta-Ming dynasty; Chinese; 253*l*. Coverlet, linen, embroidered in yellow silk; judgment of Solomon, judgment of Paris, Diana and Actæon, &c.; probably made at Soa; Indo-Portuguese; early 17th century; 120*l*.

Pilaster; a shaft and capital in five parts; glazed and lustered ware, with arabesque floral ornament in blue, white, and brown; from a mosque near Ispahan (?); Persian; 15th century (?); 100*l*.

Small collections of objects of art:—Paintings (two); oil on copper; nymphs, shepherds, and Cupid; by Angelica Kauffman, R.A.; 105*l*. the two. Ten water-colour paintings by the late Randolph Caldecott; 837*l*. 1*s*. the ten. A collection of Egyptian textiles (fragments of garments, &c.) from ancient tombs at Ekhmin (Panopolis), Middle Egypt; 800*l*. A collection of Persian objects of art, consisting of earthenware, metalwork, and textiles; 161*l*. 6*s*. 6*d*.

The donations and bequests during the year included:—Vase; Malachite, with marble base and gilt metal mounting; Russian; early 19th century; given by Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Lawrence and Miss Jamima Dunning Smith. Paintings (two); oil on canvas; portraits of a lady and a little girl; by James Northcote, R.A., 1795; English; bequeathed by Madame Madeleine Antoinette Godchaux. Dish (deep); enamelled earthenware of Talavera; painted with a star of 16 rays, ornament of flowers, birds, &c.; Spanish; 17th century; given by T. Armstrong, Esq. Bust (terra-cotta); draped male head; Renaissance style; by the late Giovanni Bastianini; Italian; about 1850–60; given by John Samuel, Esq. Cup; a standing cup in form of an ostrich, the body formed by an egg of that bird; the rest of the figure

d the base of silver, repoussé and chased; German; 17th century; given W. E. Surtees, Esq.

Bequests to Bethnal Green Museum:—Collection of paintings (oil and water-colour, and enamel on porcelain), engravings, enamels, bronzes, and statues; bequeathed by the late Joshua Dixon, Esq. Painting (oil on enamel): three sheep lying down; by T. S. Cooper, R.A., 1866. Painting (oil on canvas): the *Cleopatra* cylinder vessel, containing Cleopatra's Needle, and a hurricane in the Bay of Biscay on October 14, 1877; by E. W. Cooke, R.A., 1878. English painting (oil on canvas): a coast scene with shipping, figures round a fire on the shore; artist unknown; bequeathed by the late Sir Erasmus Wilson, F.R.S. Statue, white marble: Eve; by Patrick MacDowell, R.A., 1850; on red granite pedestal; Irish; bequeathed by the late Mrs. Dorothy Delafosse. Statuette, Sèvres white porcelain: seated figure of Rollin the historian; French; late 18th century or early 19th century; given by Lord Arthur Russell. Salt-cellar: the half of an egg-shell; French; date mark 1776-77; given by Lord Arthur Russell. Egg-cup: the half of an egg-shell; French, 1775; given by Lord Arthur Russell. Painting (oil on canvas): "The Choice of Hercules;" by Benjamin West, P.R.A., 1764; English; bequeathed by the late Mrs. Harrison. Panel: "Velvet on velvet," with floral pattern in colours on a silver ground; Italian; 17th century; given by the Countess of Effingham. Ribbon, red silk and cotton, with repeated pattern of two couchant stags confronting one another; an inscription; at the back of each is a tree; Italian; 16th century. Ribbon, white and yellow silk, with a diapered geometrical pattern; Italian; 16th century; given by Professor A. H. Church, M.A. Panel, wood, in three divisions, filled in with stucco and painted; from Lincoln's Inn; English; first half of 16th century; given by the benchers of Lincoln's Inn. Frescoes, six: specimens of true fresco painting, executed by G. F. Watts, R.A., 1845; given by the Contessa Cottrell. Painting (oil on canvas): a black and white bull standing near a bank; by J. Raymond Brascassat; French; given by Mons. Hugues Krafft. Paintings, twelve, water-colour: views of St. Peter's at Rome; by Louis Haghe; given by Charles Seeley, Esq.

**The Royal Academy of Arts.**—The principal feature of the winter exhibition of old and deceased British masters was twelve pictures by Thomas Wright of Derby, and the first instalment (43 in number) of a collection of water-colours by J. M. W. Turner. The foreign pictures included Teniers's "Village Fête," "Skittle Players," and "Fish Salesman"; de Hooghe's "Afternoon"; two landscapes by Holbein, &c. In the large room the most important works were Velasquez's "Water-seller"; an Dyck's "Duchess of Arenburg"; Reynolds's "Miss Fleming," "Lady Roughton," and "Master Braddyl"; Constable's "Hay Wain" and "Stratford Mill"; and Sir Antonio More's "Burgomaster's Daughter."

The summer exhibition, on the admission even of the President, fell below many of its predecessors in interest and merit. The works exhibited comprised 1,111 oil paintings, 287 water-colour drawings, 202 architectural designs, and 177 pieces of sculpture. The most noteworthy works were Mr. Burne-Jones's "Depths of the Sea"; Mr. S. Solomon's "Cassandra"; Mr. Alma-Tadema's "Apodyterium"; Mr. F. Holt's portraits of the Duke of Cleveland, Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., and Sir J. E. Millais; Sir F. Leighton's design for a ceiling decoration; Mr. Kensington's "Orphans"; Sir J. Millais's portrait of Mr. Barlow, R.A.; Mr. C. H. Macartney's "Robin Hood Lay"; Mr. T. C. Hook's "Sea Daisies" and "The Broken Oar": Mr.



Orchardson's "Mariage de Convenance, 'After.'" And amongst the sculptures—Mr. Thorneycroft's "Sower"; Mr. Gilbert's "Enchanted Chair"; Mr. Onslow Ford's "Folly"; and Sir F. Leighton's "Sluggard."

**The Grosvenor Gallery.**—At the winter exhibition a very complete collection of the works of Sir John Millais, consisting of 160 works, was brought together by Sir Coutts Lindsay. The earliest painted work (1848) exhibited was a portrait of Mr. W. H. Fern; and from that date to the artist's latest work, "The Ornithologist," each year of his career was illustrated by some distinctive picture. At the summer exhibition the artists most strongly represented were Mr. W. B. Richmond, Mr. Mompeser, Hon. John Collier, Mr. Eugene Benson, Mr. Walter Crane, Mr. J. Farquharson, and Mr. Napier Hemy.

Amongst the numerous minor exhibitions, that at the Society of British Artists, of which Mr. J. McN. Whistler had recently been elected president, was the most striking. After many years of almost total eclipse this society showed a marked revival, and gave the painters of the more modern Franco-American school of art a field for the display of their talents. Amongst these Mr. Stott of Oldham, Mr. Harper Pennington, Mr. Ludovici, Mr. R. Toovey, Mr. T. Roussel, and Mr. Aubrey Hunt were the most prominent.

The most important sales of the year were those of the collection of pictures belonging to H. M'Connell, Esq., 85,692*l.*; William Graham, Esq., of Glasgow, 65,310*l.*; S. Addington, Esq., 24,420*l.*; the engravings of the same collector, 8,981*l.*; his medals, 2,037*l.*; and his library, 8,522; C. Seeley, Esq., 11,605*l.*; C. J. Nieuwenhuys, Esq., 16,103*l.*; C. Toulmin, Esq., 10,888*l.*; the Blenheim collection of pictures and porcelain, 42,081*l.*; the porcelain of the Earl of Dudley, 32,109*l.*; the jewels of the Right Honourable A. J. Beresford Hope, 13,972*l.*; and the sketches and drawings of Randolph Caldecott, 5,775*l.* The libraries of the late M. Woodhull, Esq., 11,972*l.*; of Shadford Walker, Esq., 4,461*l.*; of N. P. Simes, 4,622*l.*; and of John, second Earl of Clare, 2,158*l.*

## II. DRAMA.

The retrospect of the year is far from discouraging as regards original plays of English production. In addition to the phenomenal success of Messrs. Sims and Pettitt's five-act drama "Harbour Lights," which kept the stage at the Adelphi throughout the year, several new pieces have shown that they have, to use a theatrical phrase, "money in them." In April a conspicuous piece of good fortune in this respect attended Messrs. Russell and Bashford's management at the Haymarket, which up to that time had not been particularly happy. Mr. Barrymore's Nihilist drama "Nadjerda," produced Jan. 2, had been a failure in spite of some fine scenes and some good writing; subsequent efforts were hardly more successful, and it was not till April 3, when Sir C. Young's four-act romance of modern society, "Jim the Penman," was placed on the regular bills that the luck decidedly turned. Sir C. Young's play was supported by a cast comprising Lady Monckton, Messrs. Beerbohm-Tree and Brookfield, Mr. Dacre (subsequently replaced by Mr. Willard), and Mr. Barrymore (replaced afterwards by Mr. J. H. Barnes), which carried it with a short break successfully through the year. Similar good fortune attended Mr. Pinero's three-act farce "The Schoolmistress," brought out at the Court on the conclusion of the long run of "The Magistrate," March 27, with Mrs. John Wood, Miss Norreys, Messrs.

ayton, Kerr, and Cecil in the leading parts. The prestige of the Princess's is well maintained by the production of two plays, both of which secured more than a *succès d'estime*. "The Lord Harry," a romantic play in five acts, by Messrs. H. A. Jones and Wilson Barrett, produced Feb. 18, was complete with exciting incidents of a melodramatic character. It was supported by an efficient cast, and lacked nothing in the way of scenery or stage arrangement, on which the success of such pieces so largely depends. The other production, Messrs. Barrett and Sydney Grundy's original five-act tragedy "Clito," was far more ambitious in its aim. Framed on classical lines, it exhibited considerable dramatic power, and was far from deficient in literary skill. It was well mounted and well played, Mr. W. Barrett acting the trying part with great ability, and Miss Eastlake showing a marked advance in dramatic power, the possession of which she has been gradually revealing. Mr. H. Hamilton's "Harvest," in a prologue and three acts, well suited to the stage, and supported by a cast comprising Miss A. Roselle, Cartta Addison, and Messrs. Hawtrey, York Stephens, and A. Dacre, achieved fair success at this theatre, where it appeared on Sept. 18. On the opening of the St. James's Theatre on October 25, Mr. Pinero scored another success with his new comedy "The Hobby-horse." Mrs. Kendal, Mrs. Gaston Murray, and Mrs. Beerbohm-Tree, with Messrs. Hare, Mackintosh, and Waring, took the leading parts, and were very well supported. The piece created much amusement, and ran to the end of the year, with every prospect of a long career. A domestic comedy, "The Butler," by Mr. and Mrs. Herman Merivale, afforded scope for Mr. Toole's *sui generis* unrivalled talent at his theatre, where it commenced a prosperous run in December. Mr. Derrick's comedy "Plebeians," Vaudeville, January 12, and Mr. Mark Melford's farce "Turned up," produced at the same theatre, May 27, and afterwards played elsewhere, both achieved fair success; and Mr. Boucicault's five-act comedy "The Jilt," produced at the Prince of Wales's, July 19, with Miss Myra Holme as the heroine, was well reviewed and cordially received by the audience. Messrs. Pettitt and Augustus Harris brought out with their usual success at Drury Lane, on August 28, a four-act "sporting drama," entitled "A Run of Luck," a favourable specimen of spectacular melodrama, which kept the stage till dislodged by the Christmas pantomime. Burlesque, properly so called, has conspicuously declined. A travestie of the Lyceum version of "Faust," written by Mr. Burnand, was produced at Toole's Theatre, Feb. 4, with indifferent success; and two others, viz. "Lurline," by Messrs. Reece and Farnie (Avenue, April 24), and "Oliver Grumble," by Mr. Dacre at the Novelty (March 25), fell short of the popularity which has so often attended similar pieces.

Creditable as this list is to the English playwrights, the fact must also be recognised that a good deal of work has been profitably borrowed from foreign sources, both French and German. The farce by MM. Grenet-Dancourt and Valabrègues, "Trois Femmes pour un Mari," which had a great success at the Théâtre Cluny in Paris in 1884, was very cleverly adapted by Mr. C. M. Rae, and creditably performed at the Criterion, Jan. 28, under the title "The Man with Three Wives." Georges Ohnet's romance "La Grande Marnière" was turned into a five-act comedy, "Enemies," by Mr. Coghlan, and put on the stage at the Prince of Wales's on Jan. 28. The play contained some strong passages, and afforded a congenial part to Mrs. Langtry, the parts of the lover and his father being so ably sustained by Mr. Coghlan and Mr. Fernandez. "Antoinette

Rigaud," produced at the St. James's on Feb. 18, was a translation by Mr. E. Warren from M. Deslandes's play of the same name. It met with a most cordial reception, due as much to the interest of the play as to the brilliant acting of Mr. and Mrs. Kendal and Mr. Hare. Another distinct success was achieved, May 25, at the same theatre and by the same artists with "A Wife's Sacrifice," which was adapted by Messrs. Sydney Grundy and Sutherland Edwards from Messrs. D'Ennery and Tarbes's play "Martyre," the cast comprising also Messrs. Brookfield, Waring, Cathcart, and Cooper, Misses Vane and Webster, and Mrs. Pauncefort. "Round the World" (Empire, March 8) was a new version of Jules Verne's and D'Ennery's "Round the World in Eighty Days," once very popular in Paris. A French play, called "Germaine," written about thirty years ago, and founded on M. Edmond About's novel of the same name, furnished the material for an adaptation by Mr. Frank Harvey, under the title "Life and Death," which appeared at the Grand on August 16. From Germany came "The Pickpocket," adapted by Mr. G. P. Hawtrey from Von Möser's "Mit Vergnügen," which appeared at Easter at the Globe. Amusingly rendered by Miss C. Grahame and Messrs. Hill and Penley and others, it at once caught the popular taste, and retained it throughout the year. "A Night off, or a page from Balzac," produced at the Strand by the American Daly Comedy Company on May 27, was also a very amusing adaptation, and became very popular. It was from the pen of Augustine Daly, but was based on "Der Raub der Sabinerinnen," by Franz von Schonthan. Mr. B. C. Stephenson's three-act version of Oscar Blumenthal's "Der Probepfeil," which came out at the Haymarket on Feb. 4 with the title "A Woman of the World," was not equally fortunate, though Miss Helen Barry and Miss Forsyth and Messrs. Beerbohm-Tree, Brookfield, Gilbert Farquhar, and H. Kemble did all that fine acting could do to win success. Mr. W. G. Wills's version of Goethe's "Faust" held the stage the whole year at the Lyceum, with the exception of a short interval in the summer when the theatre was closed. The illness of Miss Ellen Terry necessitated a temporary change in the rôle of Marguerite, which was more than creditably filled for the time by Miss Emery. Mrs. Chippendale replaced Mrs. Stirling as Martha on the reopening of the theatre on Sept. 11. The prolonged run of the piece, which at the end of the year showed no signs of coming to an early conclusion, falsified the fears of those who predicted that it would be crushed by the enormous expense of putting it on the stage. A three-act farce called "The Churchwarden," adapted for stage purposes by Edward Terry from a translation from the German of Herr Kneisel by Messrs. Cassell and Ogden, after a run in the provinces made its appearance at the Olympic in December, and gave promise of a successful career. Mr. Robert Buchanan's four-act comedy "Sophia," produced at the Vaudeville on April 12, was the solitary instance of successful adaptation of the novelist's work. This was a good, though not a close, rendering of incidents in Fielding's "Tom Jones." After a short run in the spring it resumed the boards at the same theatre in October, and with the aid of careful acting and good mounting retained its popularity throughout the year with every prospect of its continuance.

Turning to revivals of old work, we find that English high comedy is able, when satisfactorily presented, to attract good audiences. In the spring Mrs. Bernard Beere played Miss Hardcastle in "She Stoops to Conquer," at the Haymarket; and Miss Kate Vaughan, who has now abandoned burlesque

and the, to her, new field of comedy, assumed the same part at the Gaiety in the first of a series of Wednesday mornings. Miss Vaughan now became the central figure in some old comedy performances which took place, first at the Vaudeville, where she was supported by Mr. Lionel Brough and Mr. Conway in the "School for Scandal," and afterwards at the Haymarket, which opened at the end of July under Mr. Conway's direction for a series of similar revivals. Her impersonation of Lady Teazle was creditable, as were also Mr. Conway's Charles Surface, and the Sir Peter Teazle of Mr. Farren. The stage arrangement, especially the minuet, was most satisfactory, and the costumes excellent. Revivals of Colley Cibber's "She Would and She Would Not" and of Garrick's comedy "The Country Girl" took place at the Strand, which was occupied for some time during the summer by the Daly American Company; and later on Musker's comedy "Garrick," "The Revivals," and the "School for Scandal" were revived at the same theatre by the Compton Comedy Company. Several popular plays of recent date appeared. On the withdrawal of "Mayfair" from the St. James's on Jan. 7, Mr. and Mrs. Kendal revived for a short time the successful play "Impulse," with a powerful cast; and the favourite piece "Confusion" was reproduced in February at the Vaudeville, the original cast being modified by the introduction of Misses Maud Millett and Kate Rorke. At Easter "Human Nature" reappeared at Drury Lane, Mr. Harris playing the hero in place of Mr. Henry Neville, and Mr. Robert Pateman replacing Mr. Thorne as Lambkin. In the month of July Mr. Wilson Barrett revived "Claudian" for a few nights at the Princess's, and wound up the season on July 31 with the performance of "Hamlet." Other interesting revivals were "The Serious Family," with Mr. Toole as Aminadab Sleek (Toole's in May); O'Keeffe's "Wild Oats" at the Criterion by the Wyndham Company (June), and "David Garrick" (November); Tom Taylor's "The Fool's Revenge," with Mr. Hermann Vezin as Bertuccio (Opéra Comique, July); and Holcroft's "The Road to Ruin" (Vaudeville, July), with Misses Kate Rorke and Sophie Larkin and Messrs. F. and T. Thorne and J. Fernandez.

The supply of musical comedy and *opéra bouffe*, though plentiful, was apparently not in excess of the demand. Sir A. Sullivan and Mr. Gilbert's Japanese extravaganza "The Mikado" kept the stage at the Savoy throughout the year, being preceded on Feb. 11 by a pleasing *lever de rideau* by Mr. Frank Desprez, called "The Carp," with music by Mr. Alfred Cellier. Mr. George Edwardes, the new manager at the Gaiety, brought out on Sept. 25 a very successful comedy opera called "Dorothy," from the pen of Mr. B. C. Stephenson, afterwards transferred to the Prince of Wales's Theatre. The music by Mr. Alfred Cellier was far above the average, and soon became very popular, the piece showing no signs of waning at the end of the year. "The Palace of Pearl," a musical extravaganza by Messrs. Younge and Alfred Murray, music by Messrs. Stanislaus and Jakobowski (Empire, June 12), contained some excellent ballets and brilliant spectacular effects. The cast was, moreover, good, including Misses Grace Huntley and Wadman and Mons. Marius. Mr. Mark Melford's one-act musical comedy "Blackberries," produced at the Comedy on July 31, was also a taking little piece. In addition to the above, which may be classed as of home growth, a good deal of work of this description was imported from France. Louis Hervé's "Frivoli," with English words by Mr. Beatty-Kingston, was produced at Drury Lane, June 29; and Adolphe Adam's familiar "Postillon de Longueau" at the Empire on August 21. "The Commodore" and "Indiana,"

which appeared at the Avenue, May 10 and October 11, were versions by Mr. H. B. Farnie respectively of Offenbach's operetta "La Créole" and a comic opera by Audran.

Performances of French plays by French companies have now become an established institution in London, and those which took place at the Royalty and Her Majesty's Theatre in 1886 may be pointed to in proof of how much may be achieved by high-class acting with scarcely any aid from scenic appliances. The series at the Royalty was continued on Jan. 11 with Messrs. Ferrier and Bocage's comedy "La Doctoresse," produced in Paris in 1885, and now admirably played by Mme. Magnier and M. Noblet. Mlle. Gerfaut and M. Bahier contributed with others to a most amusing revival of Messrs. Gondinet and Civrac's "Clara Soleil." At Easter, Mme. Sarah Bernhardt appeared at Her Majesty's for a few representations of her favourite parts, "Fédora," "La Dame aux Camélias," and "Adrienne Lecouvreur," and, though but poorly supported, succeeded by her individual genius in securing the rapt attention of her audience. On the resumption of the series on June 7, Mlle. Jane Hading, who then assumed the rôle of leading lady, was far more fortunate in her associates. A very strong cast, comprising Mme. Magnier and Messrs. Landrol, Noblet, Damala, Romain, and Bahier, was provided for the younger Dumas's comedy "Denise," in which Mlle. Hading played the heroine. This play, the latest work of the French dramatist, had already achieved a great success at the Théâtre Français, and had been looked forward to with great interest in London. The series included also impersonations of "Mlle. de Belleisle" and of "Ruy Blas," with Mlle. Hading as the Queen and M. Noblet as Don Cæsar; and concluded with "Frou-Frou," supported by the same actress, and by Messrs. Damala, Landrol, Noblet, and Bahier.

Three events, interesting from a literary rather than theatrical point of view, remain to be chronicled—viz. a performance by dramatic students at the Court, in January, of Dryden's comedy "Secret Love, or the Maiden Queen"; an invitation performance under the auspices of the Shelley Society at the Grand, in May, of the poet's tragedy "The Cenci," with Miss Alma Murray as Beatrice, Miss Maude Brennan as the Countess, Mr. Herman Vezin as the Count, and Mr. Outram as Orsini; and lastly, Mr. Browning's "Strafford," first played in 1887 by Macready, which was given at the Strand in December.

### III. MUSIC.

Dramatic music in 1886 fared on the whole better than for some years past, in spite of a most inauspicious commencement. An attempt was made on Feb. 27 to start Italian opera at cheap prices at Her Majesty's Theatre with "Il Trovatore," but after one or two very indifferent performances the season came to an abrupt termination through a strike of the orchestra and chorus. The *fiasco* gave rise to a widespread belief that Italian opera, which had been languishing for the past few years, had at length received its *coup de grâce*. The Covent Garden season, under the auspices of a judicious and courageous *impresario*—Signor Lago—served, however, to dissipate this view, and probably to preserve to London an art which, as the result showed, can still command many votaries. The series consisted of twenty-six performances, mostly of very well-known operas. The orchestra under Signor Bevignani was efficient, and the well-trained chorus showed a remarkable



improvement on recent seasons in volume and quality of voice. Unfortunately no similar improvement was perceptible in the scenery or stage arrangement. The services of Madame Albani as leading soprano were secured for some few nights, and assured in every case a full house; while the reappearance after an absence of many years of the Spanish tenor Signor Gayarré was eagerly welcomed. The season opened on May 25 with "Lucrezia Borgia," the title rôle falling to Madame de Cepeda, a dramatic soprano who first appeared on the London stage several years ago. Signor Pandolfini played the Duke very finely, and Signor Gayarré amply filled the exacting tenor part. To atone for the absence of some of the leading "stars," some very welcome new-comers were introduced by Signor Lago to the London public. Miss Ella Russell, a lady with a pure and full soprano voice, and a good *méthode*, made, as Gilda in "Rigoletto," a very favourable impression, which was strengthened by subsequent appearances as Lucia, Linda di Chamouni, the Queen in the "Huguenots," Susanna, and Rosina in the "Barbieri." Mlle. Giulia Valda, an American soprano, made her début as the page in "Un Ballo in Maschera," an opera which had not been played for eight years. This lady brought with her a good reputation from Italy and Paris, which was fully justified by her singing in this and other parts, including that of the heroine in a revival of "Ernani." Mlle. Teodorini, with worn voice but rare dramatic power, which reached its highest development in the part of La Gioconda in Ponchielli's opera, was a great source of strength to the company. Mlle. Lubatovi, a *débutante*, sustained some of the contralto parts, others falling to the skilled hands of Mme. Scalchi. The tenor parts were divided between Signori Gayarré, Marini, Runcio, and De Falco (a new-comer). Signor d'Andrade, hitherto a stranger to the London boards, possesses a rich baritone voice under admirable control, as well as dramatic power of a high order, his rendering of the Jester in "Rigoletto" and the Spy in "La Gioconda" being especially fine. The parts of Don Giovanni, the Count in "Figaro," and Figaro in the "Barbieri" were supported by the accomplished French baritone M. Maurel. The performance of "Lohengrin" with Madame Albani and Signor Gayarré was marred by the absence through illness of Signor d'Andrade, which necessitated the excision of most of the music allotted to Telramund. Miss Josephine Yorke was the Ortrud. The season closed on July 19, when the "Barbieri" was given to a crowded house for the benefit of Signor Lago.

Concurrently with the above, a short series of opera in English was given at Drury Lane by Mr. Carl Rosa, supported mainly by the same leading artists as in previous years. Mr. Rosa shared the conductor's seat with Mr. Goossens. The orchestra and chorus were as usual well trained, though the latter was somewhat deficient in volume of voice—comparing unfavourably in this respect with the Italian company. On the other hand, the *mise en scène* by Mr. Augustus Harris and the general stage management were immeasurably superior. The novelty of the season was Mr. Mackenzie's new opera, "The Troubadour," produced on June 8. The work, which is of the Wagner school, was remarkably well put on the stage, and, in spite of a somewhat uninteresting *libretto* (by Dr. Hüffer), was well received. Margarida, the leading part, was well filled by Mlle. Valleria; Mr. McGuckin was the Troubadour; Miss Marian Burton, Azalais; and Mr. Leslie Crotty Count Raimon. Among other operas given were Goring Thomas's "Esmeralda"; "Nadeshda," with a new American contralto, Miss Dickerson, as the

Princess; "Carmen," with Mr. Scovell, a new tenor, also American, as Don José; and "Manon," Mr. McGuckin replacing the late Mr. Maas as Des Grieux.

In the autumn, M. Mayer, well known in connection with recent performances of French drama in London, gave a series of French grand opera at Her Majesty's Theatre, interspersed with *opéra bouffe*. The experiment was attended with doubtful success, neither orchestra nor chorus being of a quality to do justice to serious works. At the same time it served to introduce to the London public some artists of distinction, notably Madame Galli-Marié—the original exponent of the part—as Carmen; M. Duchesne, a powerful Don José; and Madame Fides-Devries, whose rendering of Marguerite in Gounod's "Faust" was striking and original. M. Vergnet, a tenor who first visited London some years back, reappeared with voice greatly increased in volume and a highly artistic style.

The supply of orchestral concert music was above the average as regards both quantity and quality. The seventy-fourth season of the "Philharmonic," which opened on March 4, was more than usually brilliant, the tone and execution of the orchestra evoking warm and general commendation. Sir A. Sullivan was the regular conductor, though on several occasions when novelties were given the *bâton* was surrendered into the hands of the composer. The vitality and enterprise of this old society were exemplified in the production of new works written specially for it, such as Mr. Gadsby's orchestral scene "The Forest of Arden" (first concert), a new symphony by Saint-Saëns (May 19), and a new suite for orchestra by Moskowski (last concert). Other interesting novelties were a violin concerto in C by Moskowski, played at the first concert by M. Tivadar Nachez, and Bottesini's overture to "Graziella" (March 18).

The thirtieth series of Saturday concerts at the Crystal Palace was resumed, after the usual Christmas interval, on Feb. 13 with a performance of Dvorák's "Spectre's Bride," conducted by Mr. Mackenzie. The programmes for the season were arranged mainly on the same lines as in former recent years, except that rather more prominence is now given to choral works. Modern music claims an increasing share of the attention of Mr. Manns's fine orchestra, yet the works of the classical masters are not neglected. At the second concert some quaintly scored dance music, written by Léon Delibes for the performance at the Comédie Française of "Le Roi s'amuse," was given for the first time in England. Other *quasi*-novelties in the course of the season were Berlioz's ballet airs from "Les Troyens," a selection from Rubinstein's second suite, and Moskowski's orchestral pieces "Aus aller Herren Länder." The programme of March 20 was devoted to Gounod's trilogy "Mors et Vita"; that of April 10 consisted entirely of works by Franz Liszt, and that on April 17 of the same composer's oratorio "St. Elizabeth," the old pianist being present at both concerts and being very warmly received. Between Oct. 16, when the thirty-first season commenced, and Christmas, Dvorák's oratorio "St. Ludmila" (see below, Leeds), Berlioz's "Childhood of Christ," a Liszt memorial concert, Sullivan's "Golden Legend" (Leeds), and a Weber anniversary concert (Dec. 18) were given. A novelty in the shape of the ballet music from Massenet's opera "Le Cid" was introduced (Oct. 16), and Gade's violin concerto in D, Op. 56, was performed for the first time in England on Nov. 13, by Mr. Dunn, a young violinist of great promise.

The usual series of Richter Concerts took place in May and June at

Hall, with a short autumn season commencing on Oct. 28. The season was more remarkable for light and shade and vigour of attack than for the quality of the strings. The most noticeable events of the spring season were the production on May 10 of Brahms's new fourth Symphony in E minor; and on June 7, which included the entire second act of "Tristan und Isolde" with Fräulein Malten, Miss Cramer, and Herren Gudehus and Henrich. The phenomenal performance of Beethoven's Mass in D at the Albert Hall on June 28, when the chorus was strengthened by a contingent of the Leeds Festival Choir. Señor Sarasate, supported by a good band under Mr. Cusins, gave a series of concerts in April and May, and attracted large audiences. The programmes presented many features, including a *sérénade mélancolique* for violin by Tchaikowsky. Herr Henschel, who appeared in the capacity of an orchestral conductor at the London Symphony Concerts at St. James's Hall in November, expended considerable energy in providing new music; prominently a symphony in E minor (No. 6) by Rubinstein (Dec. 1), and a pianoforte concerto by Franz Huber, a little-known but talented composer. At the concert on Dec. 1 some rarely heard music by Weber was given, including a concert-sonata.

The choir at the Albert Hall under Mr. Barnby still retained the leadership of the vocal societies. The season began on Feb. 10 with Sir A. Sullivan's "Antioch," under the composer's *bâton*, and embraced performances of Gounod's "Redemption" and Berlioz's "Faust," both of which held in high esteem on the public, and a special performance of Gounod's trilogy "Vita," given by royal command, Feb. 26, in which the cuts were made as to somewhat impair the purpose of the work. At the first concert of the 1886-87 season on Nov. 3, Herr Henschel reappeared, and at a later concert Sir A. Sullivan's "Golden Legend" (see below) was given before a very crowded audience.

The Leeds Oratorio Concerts under Mr. Mackenzie continued a prosperous season from Feb. 2 to April 6, and again from Oct. 29 to Christmas. The season was satisfactory, and the chorus, though at times wanting in numbers, was on the whole efficient. The first performance in London of "The Spectre's Bride" was due to this society, Mr. Lloyd singing the part which had been allotted to the late Mr. Maas. A fine performance of Liszt's "St. Elizabeth" in presence of the composer brought the season to a close. New works composed for Leeds (see below)—viz. "The St. Ludmila," conducted by the composer (Oct. 29), "The Golden Legend" (Nov. 23), and Villiers Stanford's cantata "The Revenge" and Mr. Lloyd's "Story of Sayid" (Dec. 14)—supplied mainly the programmes for the three concerts before Christmas. The concerts of the Sacred Harmonic Society, which resumed operations under Mr. Cummings on Jan. 15, and those on Dec. 8 for 1886-87, and those of Leslie's Choir (April 14 and 15) do not call for much remark except on the score of continued activity. Though neither society occupies the pre-eminent position of former years, their disappearance would disappear without general regret.

The post of conductor of the Bach Choir was this year assumed by Dr. Stanford. The opening programme on March 25 included the third act of Wagner's "Tristan und Isolde," which was ably performed, in spite of difficulties generally considered prohibitive. In June, some concerts attracted gradually increasing interest were given at St. James's Hall by a choir under the direction of M. Slaviansky d'Agrenoff.

Turning to chamber music, we find the Saturday and Monday Popular Concerts occupying, as for many years past, the foremost place. The season, which began in the middle of January and ended on April 19, was indeed rather more than usually brilliant. At the earlier concerts Herr Hausmann officiated as violoncellist during the absence of Signor Piatti through an accident to his arm, which fortunately did not permanently affect his playing. Among distinguished artists who appeared in the course of the season were M. de Pachmann, Mlle. Kleeberg, and Madame Schumann at the piano, Signor Bottesini, the famous double-bass, and Herr Joachim, whose playing of Bach's concerto for two violins in D minor with Madame Néruda on March 15 created a *furor*. A new sonata in A minor by Miss Zimmermann (Op. 21) was given on Feb. 1 by the composer and Madame Néruda, and the concert of April 5 included two novelties—viz. a sonata in D for piano and 'cello by Signor Piatti, played by Miss Zimmermann and himself, and some variations by Madame Schumann on her late husband's "Album Blatt," No. 4. The chief events of the winter season, which began Nov. 1, were a scherzo, by Chopin, in C sharp minor, played Nov. 13 by Madame Frickenhaus; and Schubert's rarely heard ottet on Nov. 22. Princes' Hall became also the home of excellent chamber music. Four concerts were given here by Herr Hermann Francke, on Jan. 26, Feb. 20, and March 9 and 23. The distinguishing feature was a vocal quartet consisting of Miss Hamlin, Miss Lena Little, Mr. Winch, and Mr. O. H. Fischer, by whom good renderings were given of Brahms's *Liebeslieder*, Schumann's *Spanisches Liederspiel*, and some new "Tuscan songs" by Julius Röntgen, a gifted composer. The programmes at the four concerts of Madame Frickenhaus and Herr Ludwig in May and June included some very interesting items, notably a new septet for oboe, clarinet, horn, violin, viola, 'cello, and piano, by Fritz Steinbach, Kapellmeister at Mannheim. Chamber concerts were also given at this hall by a trio consisting of Messrs. Coenen, Buziau, and Lasserre, and by Mr. Charles Hallé. Between Dec. 6 and 18 twelve concerts were given on alternate mornings and evenings at the Steinway Hall by the Heckmann Quartett, where the practice was adopted of devoting to each of the masters whose works were performed a separate programme.

Herr Rubinstein's piano recitals in May and June drew enormous audiences. His selection was very varied, embracing works of Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Weber, Schubert, Schumann, Chopin, and modern Russian composers, of whom some were scarcely known by name in England. The phenomenal power of his playing aroused great enthusiasm, though many of his interpretations, particularly of Chopin's music, were questioned by the critics.

The Leeds Festival opened on Oct. 13 with "Israel in Egypt," Sir Arthur Sullivan conducting. Herr Dvorák's oratorio "St. Ludmila," his first effort in that field, was produced under the composer's *bâton*. The performance, in which the solo parts were filled by Madame Albani, Madame Patey, and Messrs. Lloyd and Santley, was remarkably fine, and the work obtained a very warm reception. Sir A. Sullivan's cantata "The Golden Legend" was equally fortunate in the rendering and equally well received. Both works quickly found their way to London, where they fully confirmed the position assigned to them by the Leeds audience (see above). The other novelties produced were Mr. Mackenzie's cantata "The Story of Sayid" and Dr. Villiers Stanford's choral and orchestral rendering of Tennyson's poem "The Revenge." The famous chorus showed even higher efficiency than at

previous festivals, especially by the brilliant way in which they triumphed over the difficulties of Bach's mass in B minor.

The 168rd Festival of the "Three Choirs" was this year held at Gloucester, Oct. 7 to 10. Four new works were produced—viz. an oratorio, "The Good Shepherd," by W. S. Rockstro; a cantata by C. H. Lloyd, "Andromeda" (a strong work, which showed great advance on his previous efforts, "Hero and Leander" and "The Song of Balder"); an overture by Miss Rosalind Ellicott; and an orchestral suite by Mr. Hubert Parry. Madame Albani and other leading artists were retained, and the amalgamated choirs and orchestra were very satisfactory.

A smaller triennial festival took place at Wolverhampton, Sept. 16 and 17, under the direction of Dr. Heap, who also contributed a new work in the shape of a cantata, "The Maid of Astolab." This and "The Bride of Triermain," by Mr. F. Corder, also a novelty, were both meritorious works, and achieved fair success. A competent orchestra had been secured from Birmingham, which, with the assistance of Mr. Carrodus as leader, and good soloists, carried the undertaking to a satisfactory conclusion.



## SCIENCE OF THE YEAR 1886.

## CHEMISTRY.

**New Elements.**—The place of honour in the chemical progress of the year must be given to the discovery of a number of new metals by Crookes, Marignac, L. de Boisbaudran, and Winkler. The discovery and determination of the properties of each new element are matters of the greatest interest, since, by Mendelejeff's classification of the known elements according to their atomic weight, it is possible to predict with considerable accuracy what properties certain undiscovered elements will probably possess. From the date of the publication of Mendelejeff's table several new metals have been described, all of which can be arranged to fill up gaps intentionally left in it. Mr. Crookes has attempted to extend Mendelejeff's theory in order to furnish an explanation of the nature and possible mode of formation of the chemical elements. While certain elements—such, for example, as oxygen and iron—differ so greatly from each other as to possess few properties in common, others, such as zinc and magnesium, resemble each other as two well-marked genera of the same natural order of plants or animals might do; while others, again, differ from each other so slightly that their detection and separation are effected with the greatest difficulty. It is among this last group that the greatest additions have been made. No less than fourteen have been announced during the past year, eight of them by Mr. Crookes, and the rest by the chemists already mentioned. This number may be reduced on investigation, since all are found only in a few rare minerals. The group of elements to which they belong is regarded by Crookes as being in a state of imperfect differentiation. These metals have been recognised by the bands given when examined by the spectroscope. One of the metallic spectra described by Soret has been reinvestigated by Lecoq de Boisbaudran. By repeatedly treating the earths giving this spectrum with ammonia and potassium sulphate, two substances are obtained giving distinct spectra. To the metals contained in these earths the names of holmium and dysprosium have been given. By similar processes Crookes has partially separated eight different earths, each giving a distinctive spectrum. A new metal, to which the name of germanium has been given, has been discovered by Clemens Winkler in argyrodite, an ore of silver, from Himmelsfürst, near Freiburg. The new member of the family of metals was discovered owing to a loss in analysis of from six to seven per cent., which remained unaccounted for after several trials. This led to a search for the new element, which resembles antimony in its properties. Its sulphide is black when prepared in the dry way, but white when obtained by precipitation. Like the sulphides of arsenic and antimony, this white sulphide is soluble in alkaline sulphides. The metal, like arsenic, is of a grey colour and slight metallic lustre, but is less volatile than either arsenic or antimony. The determination of the atomic weight of germanium will show what position it occupies in the classification of elements according to

andelejeff's table, in which there is a vacancy for a new element between timony and bismuth.

**Manufacture of Hydrogen Gas.**—MM. Hembert and Henry have arranged a cheap method for the production of hydrogen in large quantities use in filling balloons, for reduction of metallic oxides, or for heating purposes. Superheated steam is injected into a retort containing white-hot coke. The action of the steam on the coke results in the formation of hydrogen and carbonic oxide gases. These gases are conveyed into a second retort filled with rough lumps of some non-fusible material, so as to expose large surface. This retort is strongly heated, and steam at a high temperature forced into it. This additional quantity of steam acts on the carbonic oxide, forming hydrogen and carbonic acid gas. The carbonic acid is separated from the hydrogen by lime or other absorbent. In practice has been found that one ton of coke will produce about 115,000 cubic feet hydrogen.

**Use of Metallic Sulphates in Agriculture.**—Sulphate of copper (blue vitriol) has been found useful in France in preventing attacks of mildew on grapes, and in curing vines already attacked. The sulphate of copper is dissolved in ten times its weight of water, and mixed with an amount of slacked lime equal to that of the sulphate of copper. This mixture is then sprinkled over the stems of the vines. It is found that wine made from the grapes of vines thus treated contains no copper, though the leaves and stalks contain a notable quantity. Sulphate of iron (green vitriol) has been recommended by Dr. A. B. Griffiths as a useful manure for moss-infested pastures.

**Absorption of Free Nitrogen.**—M. Berthelot has published in the "Comptes Rendus" the results of a large number of experiments on the fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by clay soils. Five sets of experiments were made on four different samples of clay soils. Two samples were of yellow argillaceous sand, one of a white clay, and the fourth of crude asphalt. The samples were placed in glazed earthenware pots. One set of the four soils was left for many months in a closed freshly plastered room, well lighted and dry. Samples taken for analysis showed a steady increase in the amount of combined nitrogen. Another set of samples were placed in a meadow protected from rain overhead, but not from side showers or air currents. Another series was placed on the top of a tower, and a fourth in a closed flask, and placed some in the dark and some in diffused light. In all these cases the amount of combined nitrogen increased.

**New Dyes.**—A new class of dyes has been described by Dr. O. N. Witt, to which he gives the name of eurhodines. A solution of eurhodine in ether is a bright yellow in colour, and possesses a splendid green fluorescence. Salts of eurhodine dissolve in concentrated sulphuric acid, giving an intense red colour. On diluting this solution it becomes green, and on further dilution blue. It can be made to give a splendid scarlet dye to silk, but this colour unfortunately changes to yellow by prolonged washing in a hard water. The eurhodines are of interest to chemists on account of being formed from orthodiamines, previous dye-stuffs, such as safranine, having been formed from paradiamines.

**Saccharin.**—This substance, discovered some years ago by Fahlenberg and Remsen, has come into notice owing to its remarkable sweetening property. It dissolves easily in hot water, giving an intensely sweet taste with a slight almond flavour, perceptible when only one part of saccharin is present in 10,000 parts of water. Saccharin is apparently without any

harmful effects when given in doses of .1 gramme in the food of dogs and rabbits. Its effect in assisting digestion is also trifling. Saccharin has previously been known as anhydro-orthosulphaminebenzoic acid, which represents its constitution as a result of the union of benzoic acid, sulphuric acid, and ammonia, with the elimination of hydrogen and water.

**Physiological Action of Alkali Metals.**—If a solution of the chloride of one of the alkali metals, lithium, potassium, and rubidium be injected into the veins of an animal in sufficient quantity, death ensues. The minimum quantity required is different for each metal, lithium being the most poisonous of the three, and rubidium the least. M. C. Richart, who has been studying the actions of these chlorides, finds that the varying amounts required are proportional to the atomic weights of the three elements, *i.e.* that the metals are equally poisonous if an amount of substance be used proportional to the numbers 7, 39, and 85, which represent the atomic weights of lithium, potassium, and rubidium respectively. From this it would follow that the poisonous effect of these chlorides is really a chemical action, and this action is probably the replacement of the sodium chloride in the tissues by the injected salt.

**New Substitutes for Chloral.**—MM. Baumetz and Bardet have proposed the use of phenyl-methyl ketone as a sleep-producing agent. They find that in its action it is far superior to chloral, and when administered in small doses of .05 to .15 gramme it produces sound sleep, followed by no ill after-effects. The mode of administration recommended is in gelatine capsules with glycerine. Large doses of .5 gramme injected under the skin of a guinea-pig caused death, the animal passing into a state of coma, dying in five or six hours. Another hypnotic agent is ethyl carbamate. This, when given in doses of .1 gramme, induces a quiet sleep, which passes off without leaving any ill effects behind it. This, at least, has been the result, according to R. von Jaksch, in some twenty cases which he has observed.

### PHYSICS.

**Dilatancy.**—In a lecture delivered at the Royal Institution, Professor Osborne Reynolds showed a series of interesting experiments on a newly recognised property of granular masses, which he has named *dilatancy*. Professor Reynolds was led to its discovery by considering the mechanical properties a medium must possess to act the part of the light-transmitting ether. As a result, it appeared that the simplest conceivable medium which could possess these properties would consist of a mass of rigid granules in contact with each other, provided that such a shape or fit could be given to these granules that, while the grains themselves rigidly preserved their shape, the mass should increase in bulk when its shape was altered by some external force. To obtain this paradoxical result, the interstices between the grains must increase. Subsequent consideration led to the fact that what was wanting would be a mass of smooth hard grains, each grain being held by its immediate neighbour, and the outside grains being so controlled as to prevent their rearrangement. Thus, if a pile of shot be changed from a close to more open order, this can only occur by the outside balls being moved first, those in the interior being then compelled to follow. In no case could a rearrangement of order start from the inside to the outside. To control the movements of the outside members of a mass of grains, or shot, a thin india-rubber bag was used, in which the outside grains embedded themselves. This

also enabled the volume of the interstices to be measured by the admission of air or water. An india-rubber bag holding six pints of sand full of air without air was connected by a tube with a vessel of water. On being squeezed between the pressure-boards it drew in nearly an extra pint of air. On increasing the pressure some of this water was ejected; on continuing the increase of pressure some was again absorbed, showing that as the change of form proceeded the medium went through maximum and minimum dilatations. Since a dilatant medium cannot change its shape without changing its volume, it follows that if change of volume is prevented change of shape will not occur. Thus, a spherical bag of sand closed to prevent air or water entering it, with the sand arranged in its densest form, bore a pressure of 200 lbs. without change of shape, though on opening communication with the pressure-gauge it was shown that the pressure of the water in the bag was less than that of the atmosphere by nearly 20 inches of mercury. Dilatancy, though thus a property of masses of hard granules in contact, is also a property of ordinary matter, since in an ordinary mass of matter the elasticity, cohesion, and friction existing between the molecules render them capable of acting merely the part of grains whose only function is to maintain their form. The property of dilatancy in a medium such as the ether would render it capable of causing an attraction like gravitation between bodies at a distance, and forces like cohesion and elasticity between bodies brought together. In fact, the discovery of this property allows of a new field of investigation independent of the ether itself.

**Low Primary Batteries.**—Mr. Maquay has brought out a new form of primary battery, in which the waste of material while the battery is not at work is greatly reduced. Primary batteries for electric lighting have been generally discarded, owing to the small proportion of the material consumed which is usefully employed in actual use. In the form adopted by Mr. Maquay the positive and negative elements are carbon and zinc. To check polarization it has been customary to amalgamate the zinc by rubbing it with mercury; but this amalgamation requires frequent renewal—a fatal defect in a battery for domestic use. Mr. Maquay obviates this difficulty by plating the zinc with an amalgam of tin or lead. In an experiment made with a small cell by Professor J. A. Fleming the current strength had only fallen off  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. at the end of five hours.

Another new primary battery is that invented by Mr. Upward. In this battery the elements used are zinc and carbon, the zinc being placed in a porous pot surrounded with a solution of chloride of zinc, the carbon being packed in a space outside the pot. The exciting fluid in this battery is the gas chlorine. Chlorine is admitted by a tap at the bottom of each cell, rises in it displacing the air, and then flows on to the next cell, filling them all. The chlorine acts on the zinc forming zinc chloride, which is washed away in the next cell by a slight flow of water. The chlorine is obtained by acting on manganese dioxide by hydrochloric acid in a suitable retort, the gas being dried till required for use in an aspirator.

**Self-Induction of an Electric Current.**—It has long been known that an electric current on commencing to flow in a wire induces a feeble counter-current in the same wire in an opposite direction; and similarly on ceasing to flow, another momentary current is induced in the same direction. These two points were clearly proved by Faraday in 1834. Professor Hughes has, however, largely increased our knowledge of this subject by his researches with the induction balance, or sonometer, which he

has invented. From a numerous series of experiments Professor Hughes finds that the self-induced or extra current, as it is generally termed, depends not merely upon the resistance of the conductor, or upon the electro-motive force of the current employed, but chiefly on the material of which the conductor is composed, its molecular condition, and its shape. Since rapid telegraphy and long-distance telephoning depend largely upon the success with which induction of all kinds can be kept in control, the value of these researches is readily apparent. Professor Hughes finds that if wires of gradually increasing diameter are used, the inductive effect increases up to a certain maximum, and then decreases. This maximum diameter he gives as 3 millimètres for hardened iron, 4 millimètres for copper, and 6 millimètres for brass wire. As regards the time taken in charging and discharging a current, it is found that iron takes seven times as long as copper in receiving or releasing a current, while the effect of making an iron wire red-hot is to reduce its self-induction below that of copper.

M. Semmola has discovered that if a metal plate be supported on an insulated stand and connected with an induction machine, so as to be intermittently electrified and discharged, a musical note may be produced. He uses for showing this phenomenon a plate about 1 millimètre thick, supported on an ebonite funnel, and connected at opposite sides to the terminals of an induction coil. The current is then arranged to give a succession of sparks, when the plate begins to sound.

**Ben Nevis Earth Currents.**—Some observations on earth currents have been made on the telegraph line to the summit of Ben Nevis, which will be of interest as throwing some light on these obscure phenomena. It was noticed that during the twenty-four hours the direction of the current was reversed four or five times, and that the strength of these currents increased up to a maximum, then gradually declined till a reverse current set in, which in its turn gained in strength and then died away. Maxima were noted to occur at 2 A.M., 10 A.M., and 9 P.M.; and minima at 5 A.M., 1 P.M., and 8 P.M. During these observations the mountain was almost continually covered with mist or storm-cloud, but it was observed that during a fall of snow the direction of the current was always down the line.

**Permanent Magnetic Polarity.**—Dr. Tumlriz has found that quartz crystals, when submitted to the inductive action of a powerful magnet, exhibit a decided polarity. This polarity is not confined to quartz, as Professor Lodge has found by numerous experiments that many other substances show traces of a permanent magnetic polarity. Professor Lodge's apparatus consisted of a large electro-magnet with poles about 1 centimètre apart, arranged so that either a strong or weak current could be sent in either direction through its coils. It was found that a piece of coke, which under the action of the weak current pointed some  $60^\circ$  on one side of the magnetic axis, changed its position on reversing the current to some  $60^\circ$  on the other side. A piece of boxwood which set itself almost equatorially, on reversing the current, swung round and set itself again equatorially, but with ends reversed. If the strong current is used these effects are not observed, the permanent magnetism of the substance under trial being instantly destroyed and reversed. It appears not to matter whether a substance is magnetic or diamagnetic: when the weak current is reversed the position of the substance is reversed. It must, however, be noted that, to produce ~~this~~ permanent magnetism, a strong current is necessary. Professor Lodge further points out that, though the existence of some amount of permanent



magnetism in all matter is not at all improbable, many of his results might be produced by a trace of iron impurity in the substances experimented on, though endeavours were made to remove any such impurity so far as was chemically possible.

Dr. R. von Helmholtz has published the results of his experiments on the tension of vapours. These results throw considerable light on the formation of clouds. Dr. Helmholtz experimented with salt solutions placed under conditions such that the smallest lowering of pressure which produced condensation of vapour could be readily observed. The apparatus consisted of a glass cylinder filled to about one-third with the solution; the rest of the space contained a mixture, air and vapour, and was in communication with a manometer for measuring the amount of pressure, and with an air-cock which allowed the pressure to be increased or diminished as was required. To detect the formation of cloud, a beam of light was directed along the axis of the cylinder, and the observations were taken by looking through the cylinder in a line forming a small angle with this axis. It was found that with pure water at ordinary temperature no cloud formation was observed until the pressure was reduced to a certain amount, which increased as the temperature was lowered. Saturated air might suffer a reduction of pressure by as much as half an atmosphere without cloud being formed, provided the air was free from dust particles. Dr. Helmholtz confirms, therefore, the observations of Coulier and Aitken, that no cloud is formed in the absence of dust particles. The finer the dust the more slowly is the cloud formed. Salt particles and acids favour the formation of cloud, sal ammoniac being particularly active in this respect. The explanation of this is found in the convex surface of the dust particles forming points of vapour tension higher than would occur at a smooth surface. Dr. Helmholtz points out that this action of dust particles supports Tyndall's view, that the blue colour of the sky is due to the diffusion of fine dust in it, since if dust were entirely absent no cloud formation would occur. The dense clouds and fogs of cities like London are ascribed to the sulphuric acid produced by the burning of coal, this acid having been found by experiment to be a good cloud producer.

Mr. Jordan has invented a new form of sunshine recorder. It consists of a cylindrical box  $2\frac{1}{2}$  inches in diameter and  $8\frac{1}{2}$  inches long, mounted on a stand which has suitable means of adjustment, according to the latitude of the recording station. The motion of the earth causes the sun's rays to mark out a line on sensitised paper placed inside the cylinder. The line is curved more or less according to the season. This photographic process gives equal results with the burning-glass sunshine recorder when the days are clear, but when much diffused cirrus or haze are present in the sky, the photographic method gives an excess of some 11 per cent. over the other form of instrument.

**Sub-aqueous Photography.**—A series of photographs have been taken in one of the caissons of the Forth Bridge, where the air pressure was as much as 25 lbs. on the square inch. At this pressure there is always a haziness in the air, which renders it difficult to obtain any sharply defined photographic image. Any variation of pressure increases this haze, so during the photographic experiments care had to be taken to keep the air pressure perfectly steady. It was found that even with the most rapid plates a comparatively long exposure was necessary. The lighting power used consisted of five arc lamps, each of 1,200 candle power, and the time of exposure varied from 7 or 8 minutes with ordinary landscape plates to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  to 2 minutes

when some exceptionally quick plates were used. When experiments on shore with the ordinary plates were made, it was found that an exposure of 10 seconds was ample to give good results, so that the artificial light and the increased air pressure in the caisson increased enormously the length of time required to secure good results. These photographs were taken by Mr. E. G. Carey, the assistant engineer of the works.

### BIOLOGY.

Mr. E. B. Poulton, of Oxford, has studied the relation existing between the colour of the larva of *Smerinthus ocellatus* and of the Lepidoptera and that of the plants on which it feeds. Mr. Poulton concludes from observation of some 200 cases that the larva maintains a colour relation with the food plant on which it is hatched, and that this relation persists during its larval life, being adjustable within certain limits to that of the plant. This adjustment is made, Mr. Poulton considers, by the direct absorption of pigment from leaf to larva, such an adjustment being a gain to the animal by increasing its power of escaping notice.

Mr. J. J. Walker, R.N., has traced the successive steps in the distribution of a well-known American butterfly (*Danais archippus*). The range of this butterfly in America is from Hudson's Bay to the River Plate, its food being chiefly the various species of *Asclepias*. This butterfly is well fitted to hold its own in the struggle for existence; the chrysalis is bright emerald-green colour, the duration of the pupal stage is twelve or fourteen days. Neither larval nor perfect forms are attacked by insect-eating birds, its sole enemy being a dipterous insect, and the insect in its perfect stage lives some twelve or fourteen months. With these advantages, it has spread westward from the States to the Sandwich Islands, and across the whole breadth of the Pacific to the Malay Archipelago. Southward and westward it has appeared in New Zealand and Australia. Eastward it has been noticed in the West Indies, and even in the Azores, while within the last ten years it has been captured in South Wales, Kent, and in 1879 in the south of France. The striking appearance of this butterfly enables it to be easily detected, and this extended and extending range is of special interest as showing how widely any particular genus of insect may spread under favourable conditions.

**The Coagulation of Blood.**—It has been known from the researches of Brücke and others that the coagulation of blood is accelerated by contact with foreign bodies and prevented by the contact of the fresh vascular walls of the blood-vessels. It was, however, found by Grünhagen that blood when received in glycerine did not coagulate so long as it did not mix with it. To determine the nature of these influences, E. Freund has made a series of experiments with the following results. He finds that if blood from the carotid artery of a dog is drawn under oil and allowed to stand at ordinary temperature, it does not coagulate in twenty-four hours. If drawn into a vessel smeared with vaseline it did not coagulate. If stirred with an oiled glass rod no fibrin was separated. If, however, it was poured from the greased to an ungreased vessel, coagulation took place in a few minutes. Further experiments showed that small quantities of dust, or the drying of the surface of the blood, or touching it with an ungreased glass rod caused coagulation even in a greased vessel. After pouring out the blood from a greased vessel, the sides of the vessel showed no blood-colouring matter, nor

the presence of any albuminous body. This is noticed in the blood-vessels, which, if emptied of blood, are found to be uncoloured by it; and if animal membranes are used which are uncoloured by the blood, then coagulation will not take place in them. It thus appears that the phenomena of coagulation are due in great degree to adhesion between the blood and a foreign body. If this adhesion is prevented, then coagulation is retarded or altogether prevented.

Dr. L. C. Woolridge, M.B., has isolated a new proteid body from the calf thymus gland of the calf, which has the curious property of being able to coagulate blood in the veins of a living animal. This body is soluble in saline salt solution, and when this solution is injected into the blood of an animal, death ensues owing to the blood clotting in the blood-vessels. The substance does not contain any fibrin ferment, nor does it give rise to the production of a ferment in the blood when injected. Its toxic effects are apparently not due to any accidental admixture, since it is completely destroyed on undergoing artificial peptic digestion, and it would then be innocuous if taken into the stomach.

Mr. Haycroft has discovered that the saliva of the leech contains a ferment which prevents the coagulation of the blood. This ferment is without any poisonous effect, and it has therefore been adopted by Professor Zuntz for use when measurements of blood-pressure have to be made. It was found that one cubic centimètre of ferment fluid was sufficient to prevent coagulation for seven consecutive hours in experiments with a kymograph.

M. E. Leudet has studied the question of the propagation of pulmonary tuberculosis by contagion by means of the records of the Rouen Hôtel Dieu during the thirty-one years 1854-1885. During this period 16,094 patients of both sexes were treated in the hospital wards, and as a result M. Leudet concludes that the propagation of tuberculosis by contagion has not been demonstrated, or is at least very restricted.

M. Maurice de Thierry has invented a new absorption spectroscope, which will enable the absorption spectrum of a fluid to be examined through a depth of three to ten mètres. The advantage gained by examining long columns of fluid is that substances can thereby be detected if present only in very minute proportions. M. de Thierry finds that one five-millionth of oxyhæmoglobin can be thus recognised.

Professor D. J. Cunningham, from investigations on the lumbar curve of man and apes, finds there is no distinctive character in that of man capable of being made a mark of a distinct group. That of a chimpanzee of four years old agreed approximately with that of a child of thirteen. Mesial sections were made through the frozen spines of the subjects. The lumbar curve is better marked in the female than the male. The flexibility of the lumbar portion will depend on the mode of life &c.

**Symbiosis in Plants.**—It appears from the observations of Kamienski, Frank, and Woronin that a considerable number of phanerogams, especially forest trees such as the cupuliferæ and coniferæ, do not derive their nourishment direct from the soil, but through the medium of a fungus mycelium which forms a layer round the growing roots. Dr. Frank finds that the roots of oaks, beeches, chestnuts, and hazels are covered with a dense layer of mycorrhiza, composed entirely of fungus hyphæ, and organically associated in growth with the root. By this structure the formation of root-tips is entirely prevented, all nutriment from the soil to the root passing through this fungus growth. The mycorrhiza makes its appearance on the

lateral roots of the young seedling, and was invariably present on all the specimens of cupuliferæ examined by Dr. Frank. This is probably due to the fact that these trees prefer a soil rich in humus, in which the mycorrhiza can flourish. Though most common in the cupuliferæ, it is not confined to this natural order. Since it seems that the presence of the mycorrhiza is useful to the tree, and as the tree appears necessary for the growth of the fungus, we have an instance of symbiosis, or joint growth, such as has been already known in the case of fungus hyphæ with the orchids. Dr. Frank suggests that this symbiosis of fungi and higher forms of plant-life is probably far more common than has been previously noticed.

### GEOLOGY.

Professor Judd has determined that the Elgin reptilian beds, the age of which has been much disputed, are undoubtedly of Triassic age, as has been suspected by the fossils. These contain certain well-marked mesozoic types, such as *Telespeton*, *Dicynodon*, and *Ceratodus*. Professor Judd now finds from sections through these reptilian beds that they rest on a bed of conglomerate three or four feet thick, called locally pebbly post. This pebbly post is more perfectly conglomerate in its lower layers, and rests on beds of pink or red sandstone, finely laminated and exhibiting much false bedding. While this conglomerate graduates insensibly into the overlying sandstones, it is sharply marked off from the sandstones below, the line of junction of the two strata showing every appearance of erosion, though no decisive evidence of difference of dip was observed. Professor Judd concludes that during the Carboniferous and Permian epochs the old red sandstone of the Elgin area was upheaved and denuded, and the Upper Trias beds then deposited unconformably on the eroded surface.

Borings have been made in the Delta of the Nile, one near Rosetta to the depth of 84 feet, and another to the depth of 78 feet. In neither case did the boring pierce through the whole of the river deposit. The stratum passed through consisted of Nile mud and desert sand, the minerals recognisable by the microscope being chiefly those found in granitic and metamorphic rocks, which therefore probably compose the greater part of the basin of the Nile. Another deep boring at Dover Guard Prison to obtain a steady supply of fresh water has been sunk 700 feet below the sea level without any influx of salt water. This shows that the Dover chalk strata are practically impervious to water, as the Channel Tunnel experimental works rendered probable.

**Earthquakes and Eruptions.**—On October 11 an earthquake was felt at Tongatabu, one of the islands of the Friendly group in the South Pacific, accompanied by a submarine volcanic outburst. On the 18th the Rev. S. W. Baker and a party of Europeans and natives went in the *Sandfly* towards the spot where the eruption had occurred, and found that a new island, some three miles long by a mile wide, and elevated some forty feet above the sea, had been formed. The highest part was the rim of the crater of the volcano, which continued in eruption, with some intermission, for some weeks. This makes the sixth volcanic peak in the Friendly Islands, the highest, Mount Kao, being 5,000 feet above the sea.

Another volcanic eruption took place in the North Island, New Zealand, near the far-famed pink and white terraces which have been described lately in Froude's "Oceana." The result of the eruption has been to

stroy, or cover with débris, these two natural wonders, and to spread a layer of volcanic dust over some 2,000 square miles of country. Fortunately very little loss of life appears to have occurred. Other earthquakes with loss of life have occurred in Greece, Africa, and Eastern Asia. Either the strata of the earth's surface are undergoing strains of unusual intensity, or, it is more probable, the observation and study of earthquake phenomena is more widely diffused.

#### ASTRONOMY.

**The Total Solar Eclipse.**—This eclipse occurred on August 29, and for observation a British expedition was despatched from Southampton on August 29 by the S.S. *Nile*. The point of observation was at Grenada, one of the West Indies, where the duration of totality was 8 min. 52 sec. A longer duration, 4 min. 45 sec., would have been obtainable at Benguela on the west coast of Africa, but this spot was not selected, as the climate was not considered favourable one. The expedition consisted of seven members, to each of whom was allotted certain definite portions of work, so as to utilise the few precious minutes to the best advantage. Good photographs of the corona were taken by Captain Darwin and Dr. Schuster, while photometric observations were made by Professor Thorpe. The amount of light during totality was described as less than that of a moonlight night. It is probable that the results obtained will, on examination, be found to add materially to our knowledge of the sun.

**Velocity of Light.**—Professor Newcomb has redetermined the velocity of light by means of a modification of Foucault's revolving mirror apparatus. As a final result, he gives the velocity as 229,360 kilometres per second, with probable error of  $\pm 80$  km. He points out that light-rays of all colours must travel with approximately equal velocity. Were there any appreciable difference, this would become observable in the light received from the stars. Thus, if there were a difference of one hour in the time taken by the red and the blue rays in travelling from the star Algol to the earth, this star would show well-marked coloration at its phases of increase and decrease. As no such effect has been noticed, there can hardly be a difference as great as four parts in a million between the velocity of rays from the opposite ends of the solar spectrum. It must be remembered that Algol is usually visible as a star of nearly the second magnitude, but in every three days it decreases in magnitude for some hours till it sinks almost to a fourth magnitude star. It continues at this magnitude for fifteen minutes, and then increases again. In a few more hours it has recovered its original brightness. The total change takes place in  $9\frac{1}{4}$  hours.

**The Asteroids.**—Professor H. A. Newton has discovered that if a mean orbit be taken for the 250 asteroids first discovered, allowing equal weight to each, then that this mean orbit lies nearer to the orbit of Jupiter, being only  $1^\circ$  inclined to it, than any single asteroid orbit does to the mean orbit. The nearest orbit of an asteroid to the mean orbit is that of Medusa, inclined  $49'$  to it; the nearest asteroid orbit to Jupiter (and the only one less than  $80^\circ$ ) is that of Euterpe, inclined  $19'$  to that of Jupiter.

**Double Stars.**—Dr. C. F. Peters, of Kiel, has recomputed the elements of the orbit of the double star 61 Cygni. He finds as a result that the period of revolution is 782.6 years, whereas the last published result, that by Mr. Hann, of Rochester, New York, gave the period as 1,159.



Herr W. Schur, of Strasburg, has published a determination of the parallax of the double star  $\psi$  Aurigæ. This he has deduced from a series of measures of the position angles and distances of the two components made on thirty nights between January 1883 and January 1885. The observations were made with the six-inch refractor of the Strasburg Observatory. As a result, Herr Schur gives the parallax as equal to  $0.11''$ , with a probable error more or less of  $0.034''$ .

**Lunar Heat.**—Professor Langley has published his observations on the heat radiated by the moon. He finds that in the lunar spectrum there is a preponderance of rays of long wave length, and that there are fewer lunar rays transmitted through glass than would be the case with solar rays. He also finds that we receive from the moon heat rays of lower refrangibility than from the sun. In the lunar spectrum there are two maxima, one corresponding to the maximum in the solar spectrum, due to the reflected light from the sun, and the other due to the moon itself, indefinitely lower in the spectrum, and corresponding, according to Professor Langley, to a temperature below that of ice. It appears that more heat is received from the moon in winter than in summer, though this is probably due to the winter atmosphere being freer from moisture, and so causing less loss by absorption. During a lunar eclipse the radiated heat disappears almost simultaneously with the reflected heat, so that the moon's surface would appear to lose its heat with wonderful rapidity.

**Stellar Photography.**—The MM. Henry have taken a series of stellar photographs which are not only remarkable for their wonderful excellence as specimens of photographic work, but also for the number of hitherto unnoticed details which have been recorded on them. Thus a new nebula has been discovered near Maia, one of the Pleiades. This nebula was invisible in the equatorial of the Paris Observatory, though it has since been noticed at Nice and in the great instrument at Pulkowa. A photograph of Saturn has been obtained showing the principal division of the ring, which is only  $0.4''$  in breadth. Other planets have also been successfully photographed, while the satellite of Neptune has been photographed at all points of its orbit, even when close to its primary. The great nebula in Orion has been taken on a plate to which two hours' exposure was given. In this all the details of the nebula are distinctly visible. Stars of the 16th and 17th magnitudes, never before distinctly seen, are visible on some of the plates. More than 600 double stars have been photographed, and forty-two fine plates have been obtained of the Milky Way and other parts of the sky. It is not merely excellence of photographic work which is necessary to achieve these results, since in such long exposures absolute steadiness in the driving gear of the instruments used is requisite to prevent blurring of the exposed plates.

**New Form of Artificial Horizon.**—M. Gautier has invented a new mercurial bath, adapted to deaden earth vibration, for use in an artificial horizon. It consists of a cast-iron basin, containing the supply of mercury. In the centre of this basin is a screw axis carrying a second basin, which communicates with the outer basin by a narrow aperture. When both basins are filled with mercury the inner layer becomes insensible to small vibration, provided the screw axis has been properly adjusted. This apparatus has enabled regular observations of the nadir to be taken for the first time in the Paris Observatory.

## GEOGRAPHY.

**Asia.**—The proposed railway communication between India and China, way of Burmah and Siam, conjoined with the annexation of Burmah by this country, has directed a large share of public attention to the comparatively unknown frontier regions to the north of Siam. Mr. Holt S. Hallett has given an interesting account of his explorations in these districts, made to determine the most practicable route for a railway to the Chinese frontier. This railway, as determined by Mr. Hallett and Mr. Colquhoun, would consist of two branches, one of which would start from the port of Moulmein in Burmah, and the other from Bangkok in Siam. These branches would meet at Raheng, on the Meh Ping, a distance of 160 miles from Moulmein, and of 800 miles from Bangkok. From Raheng the railway would be carried up the valley of the Meh Wung, through the Siamese Shan States, to Yankon. Here it would begin to cross the watershed of the Loi Kong Lome range to the valleys of the Meh Ing and Meh Low, descending the latter to the town of Kiang Hsen on the Meh Kong at the frontier of the Burmese Shan States. From Kiang Hsen the railway would go northwards 190 miles to Ssumas, the frontier town of China. Mr. Hallett describes the country as generally well peopled—there being 481 towns on his proposed railway line—and ready to welcome any attempt to increase trade facilities. Help was readily given him by the native princes, who furnished him with guides, elephants, and supplies, wherever needed. Mr. Hallett reports that game is plentiful, the country generally fertile—tea growing wild on many of the hill ranges—and the inhabitants well disposed to travellers.

In the north of China, M. Potanin has been exploring since the latter months of 1884. In November of that year he started from San Chuan, proceeding up the right bank of the Hoangho to He Cheu, through country whose chief geological formation was an old red sandstone conglomerate, covered in places with loess. From He Cheu he went up the Dasya River, following one of its tributaries, the Leuguan, to its source. He then crossed the ridge separating this river from the valley of the Tchitai, which he then descended till it joined the Yellow River, whence two days' journey brought him again to San Chuan. M. Potanin reports that the Tchitai country is peopled by the Salars, a Mussulman race who speak a Turkish (!) language, and who build their mosques in a Chinese architectural style, ornamented with figures of dragons, lions, &c. In April 1885 M. Potanin started with Skassi for the Si Nin River. This river-valley is closed in for miles between high walls of loess till the Lau Vasya gorge is passed. Beyond this the valley widens out into a large plain, on which two towns are situated. These towns are inhabited by Mongols, many of whom are Mussulmen. In the narrowest parts of the river there are gorges cut through gneiss rock, in which gold has been found. From Si Nin M. Potanin made for Min Cheu, to connect his surveys with those of Colonel Prjevalsky. That explorer has been travelling in the border range of the plateau of Thibet, having crossed the mountain Yali-san to the upper waters of the Hoangho, and the Yang-tse-Kiang. In the course of his journey he visited the Labran monastery of Buddhist monks, which is situated 10,000 feet above the sea level. He also discovered a new species of sheep, to which the name *Ovis dalai-lamæ* has been given. Colonel Prjevalsky describes the Thibet plateau as rising higher and higher towards the south-west, till it ended in a line of snow

capped mountains 22,000 feet high, over which no accessible pass could be found. Even the rivers issuing from these mountains flowed through deep clefts which could not be ascended. Colonel Prjevalsky finally turned northward into Russian territory by way of Aksu and Tianshan. We must wait for fuller details before being able to judge of all the additions this eminent traveller has made to our knowledge of this remote part of Central Asia.

The correctness of the description given by the explorer A. K. of the Sanpo river, as turning south at Gya-la-Tindong and joining the Brahmaputra, under the name of the Dihong, was doubted by Mr. R. Gordon, who considered that its course was farther east than stated by A. K., and that it turned south near Rima, and then joined the Irawadi. Mr. J. F. Needham, who made a journey in December of last year nearly to the walls of Rima, was able to prove that Mr. Gordon's theory is inconsistent with the facts, and from his own observations, and from the reports given him by Mija chiefs who visit Rima frequently, he is satisfied that A. K.'s map is correct.

Mr. W. Carles, the Vice-Consul of Corea, has given some interesting details about the little-known peninsula of Corea. Corea has an area as large as England and Wales. It is divided into eight provinces, called 'Do.' The east coast has no rivers of any importance, and no harbours capable of affording refuge to vessels. Those that do exist remain open all the winter, whereas the Russian harbours on the Pacific are frozen up. Port Lazaref is the chief harbour on the east coast. On the west the coast line is studded with thousands of islands, but on this side the harbours are generally frozen in winter. The temperature in summer often rises to 100° F., while in winter the river Han, 400 yards broad, is frozen over sufficiently hard to admit of cart traffic. The principal crops are rice, wheat, cotton, hemp, and tobacco. The northern boundary of Corea is formed by the rivers Amnok and Tuman, with the Paik-to-San range of Manchuria. Soul, the principal town, is externally like an ordinary Chinese town, with battlemented stone walls and gateways of woodwork and tiles, with portholes, behind which there are supposed to be cannon.

The most important trading town is probably Phyong-yang, with a population of 20,000. It is situated on the Tai-dong River, 86 miles from the sea. From this town Mr. Carles went northward to the Amnok River at Wi-ju. Wi-ju is the chief depot for goods to be conveyed overland to China. It has a population of some 80,000. Wi-ju shares with Kyong-heung the distinction of being the only two places at which communication between China and Corea is permitted. From Wi-ju the course of the Amnok was followed to Wi-won, and then across a country which showed plenty of volcanic rocks to the central highlands at Chang-jin, about 2,500 feet above the sea. Here some silver mines used to be worked. The highest point of the ridge was crossed shortly after leaving Chang-jin, from which point the descent to the coast at Ham-heung was extremely rapid. The distance from sea to sea by this route is given by Mr. Carles as 410 miles. Gensan, near Port Lazaref, has the appearance of a Japanese town, owing to the influx of Japanese traders attracted there by the expectation of improved trade, owing to the proximity of the port. The only Europeans in Gensan were those employed by the Corean Government in the custom-houses. Near Gensan are extensive lava fields, one of which was estimated at 20 miles long by 10 miles broad; while another was as much as 40 miles long. Mr. Carles reports that at present Corean trade is small, the mines, with the exception of copper, are

Comparatively poor, the coinage is debased, and the development of the country hindered by caste prejudices and the insecurity of property.

Mr. A. Hosie, who was appointed Consular Agent at Chung-ching in eastern China in 1881, has explored much of the country between the city

Ning-yuan-Fu in the province of Ssu-chuan and Tali-Fu in western Szechuan. This included a visit to the salt works at Pai-yen-ching, where salt is obtained from brine springs by evaporation in cone-shaped pans, which are heated by a soft coal obtained in the neighbourhood. At another spot, Tzu-liu-ching, natural gas is used to heat the brine pans, which are made flat and shallow. Mr. Hosie states that the inhabitants of the Ssu-chuan province are largely engaged in native manufactures, as much as a million pounds' worth of raw cotton being imported for working up into a coarse but substantial cloth. At Chung-ching, the chief trading centre in Ssu-chuan, the exports are nearly twice the value of the imports. Most of this trade enters and leaves by the Yang-tze-Kiang. Mr. Hosie recommends that steamers of light draught should ascend this river to Chung-ching, instead of stopping, as at present, at Ichang. He states that though for 10 miles above Ichang navigation is difficult, yet that there is no great obstacle to be surmounted during the greater part of the year. By this means, too, the transit duties now levied at Ichang would also be saved.

In North Siberia, Baron von Toll and Dr. Bange have explored the delta of the Lena and the New Siberian islands. The results obtained by the expedition are described as very satisfactory, rich collections of fossils having been formed, some four hundred species of plants, six specimens of the mountain sheep (*ovis borealis*), and large numbers of insects, mollusca, and other invertebrata obtained. At a spot 180 miles from Ustyansk, the skull of a mammoth covered with skin and hair was found. Here Baron von Toll intends to make further researches to discover, if possible, a complete skeleton. Another explorer has found mammoth remains with flint implements, showing that man was contemporary with the mammoth in this region.

**Africa.**—The Rev. S. Grenfell has explored, in the steamer *Peace*, some of the tributaries of the Congo River. Several of these were found not to be navigable for any great distance; one of them, however—the Mobangi—appears to offer a navigable water-way, clear of the French protectorates, into the heart of the Continent. Another tributary—the Juapa—was explored up to longitude  $23^{\circ} 14'$  E., and latitude  $1^{\circ} 1'$  S., where it was still a fine river some 100 yards wide, 12 feet deep, and flowing at the rate of 200 feet per minute. A third tributary—the Lulonga—flows nearly parallel to the main stream of the Congo.

Mr. W. Montagu Kerr has made a journey to Lake Nyassa from Cape Colony. His route lay through the Orange Free State and West Griqualand, along the Vaal River, through Bechuanaland to Gubuluwayo. He then skirted a range of high granitic mountains, which ran in a north-easterly direction through Matabele Land and Mashona Land. The expedition left Klecksdorf in the Transvaal on March 24, and reached Quillimane in November. He crossed the Zambesi at Tette, and, still keeping to the mountains, proceeded northwards to the south-west shore of Lake Nyassa. After travelling round the southern border of the lake, he proceeded down the river Shiré, making a détour to Blantyre, till it joins the Zambesi at Shamo, and finally reached the coast at Quillimane.

*The first part of the journey was, of course, over previously well-known*

land. At Gubuluwayo Mr. Kerr was hospitably received by Lo Bengula, the King of Matabele Land, who gave him permission to pass through his territory. From the missionary outpost of Umhlangene, north of Gubuluwayo, Mr. Kerr travelled with his small party for nearly a month without meeting a single person till he reached the river Hunyane, where the people of a Mashona chief named Chibero were met with. These people are in more or less constant war with the Matabele tribes, of whom they are in great dread. Near here Mr. Kerr abandoned his waggons and started on foot with thirty-three attendants, who, however, were soon reduced in numbers by desertion. At the town of Mchesa his men refused to advance, and for a few days the expedition appeared likely to come to an abrupt termination. After some delay a new party was formed, and a start again made northward, till they reached the stronghold of a chief named Chuzu. This chief had apparently been at war with the Portuguese, and determined to massacre the whole of Mr. Kerr's party, whose appearance in his country was so unexpected. Mr. Kerr was himself taxed by Chuzu with being a Portuguese. Receiving timely notice of Chuzu's intention, the party retreated 50 miles, and then went eastward to Inyota. Here they were well received by the chief Chibabura, who supplied Mr. Kerr with a fresh party of Makorikori. The Makorikori resemble the Mashona. Farther north, at the town of Zingabela, the natives showed great curiosity to look at Mr. Kerr, not having seen a white man before. At Chibinga, on the Ukumbura, a tributary of the Zambesi, all Mr. Kerr's old followers left him and proceeded homewards, while he with a new party again started eastward. Tette was reached five and a half months after leaving Klecksdorf. Here Mr. Kerr was hospitably entertained by the Portuguese Governor, Senor Luis Vieira Braga. After a stay of eight days he went on again with a new party, who, however, deserted him, until at an Angoni town on the Vilange River he was left quite alone. By signs he recruited a new party of six, and with them reached the head town of the Angoni king Tchikuse. Here he was kept in semi-captivity for some days, till a Portuguese elephant-hunter happened to arrive, who did all in his power to assist Mr. Kerr in satisfying the suspicions of the king, who at last allowed him to depart. The Angoni tribe are slave-hunters, and the town of Tchikuse does a large business as a slave-trading centre. At the northern borders of the Angoni tribe some native iron-smelting furnaces were passed, the ore used having probably been brown hæmatite, judging from the slag and the metal produced. On September 25 Lake Nyassa was reached at Mpemba, but being unable to cross the lake Mr. Kerr made for Livingstonia. This mission station he found deserted, and here his Angoni followers decamped. After a delay of sixteen days a small steamer was descried, from which landed Mr. Harkiss and Lieutenant Giraud, who was returning from Tanganyika, having been deserted by his men also. Mr. Kerr then accompanied Lieutenant Giraud down the Shiré River, and arrived at Quillimane after a journey of eight months' duration, in which many difficulties and dangers were happily surmounted, and a distance of 8,000 miles traversed, part of which was over entirely unknown country. Mr. Kerr kept careful notes and observations, which have enabled an excellent map of his route to be printed by the Royal Geographical Society.

At a meeting of the Geographical Society of Paris, M. de Brazza gave a summary of his ten years' work in the Congo basin. The results are as follows:—

The survey of the Ogowé has been completed; the survey of the Congo



from Nkundja to Brazzaville, and of the Alima, has been finished; important hydrographical and topographical work has been done on the coast of Loango; astronomical observations have been made; large collections formed of natural history specimens; numbers of sketches, photographs, and ethnographic notes taken; and, finally, a territory as large as France itself has been brought under French influence.

A letter was received early in January by Professor Bastian from Dr. Fischer, in which he states that he had been detained at Kahegi, on the shore of Lake Victoria Nyanza, owing to an attack of fever. He had found it impossible to reach Umjoro, where Dr. Junker was located, by way of Uganda, owing to the continued hostility of the Kabakas, who were the murderers of Bishop Hannington and his party. The Kabakas threatened Dr. Fischer with the Bishop's fate if he attempted to pass through their country. He accordingly determined to make for the Egyptian equatorial province by way of Kavirondo, making a *détour* round Uganda. His departure was hastened by an expected attack on Kahegi by the Waganda. Kahegi he describes as very unhealthy, dysentery and inflammation of the eyes being endemic, as well as fever.

Dr. Lenz writes from Stanley Falls to say that he hopes by assistance from Tippoo Tib, the great African trader, to learn something of Dr. Junker. He proposed to accompany Tippoo to Nyangwe, and go from there to Ruanda, and on to the Mwata Nzige, with the help of a party of Tippoo's men.

In the Sahara Lieutenant Palat has been murdered. He was attempting to cross the desert to Timbuctoo from Algiers. With considerable difficulty he had reached Tuat, and on the march thence, when within two days' journey of Insaleh, he was massacred by his guides, not far from the place where a few years ago the expedition under Lieutenant Flatters was massacred.

Another well-known African traveller, Major Serpa Pinto, has lately died, his expedition being transferred to the command of Lieutenant Cardozo.

As an illustration of African life an incident in a recent journey by M. Aubry may be mentioned. M. Aubry went on a scientific mission to Shoa in 1883. He started from Obock through the country of the Danakils, whom he describes as a set of robbers. The country between the coast and Shoa, especially round Lake Assal, is described as wild, barren, and parched with heat. It was not till the middle of 1884 that the travellers crossed the river Haivash and reached Ankober. Here the climate is described as perpetual spring, and the land as wonderfully fertile, while the native king, Menelik, entertained the travellers at a banquet given in European style—knives and forks, chairs and tables, decanters, and even table cloths being used. From these half-civilised people M. Aubry went through the Galla and Somali tribes, being attacked by the latter, and reaching the coast after many narrow escapes. M. Aubry surveyed the course of the Haivash for 190 miles, and also the river Mugueur, a tributary of the Blue Nile, as well as other streams. Mr. Farini has travelled in Kalahari land, which he describes as a high table land and from 3,000 to 4,000 feet above the sea, quite healthy for Europeans, and generally well suited for cultivation.

# OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1886.<sup>1</sup>

## JANUARY.

**Earl of Stradbroke.**—John Edward Cornwallis, second Earl of Stradbroke, born Feb. 13, 1794, was the eldest son of Sir John Rous, who had been raised to the peerage in 1796 as Baron Rous of Dennington, Suffolk, and made Earl of Stradbroke and Viscount Dunwich in 1821. He was educated at Westminster School, and in 1810 entered the Coldstream Guards, which he joined in the Peninsula in time to take part in the famous victory of Salamanca. With his regiment he was present in all the subsequent battles of the war, including Vittoria, the Nive and Nivelle, the sieges of Burgos and San Sebastian, the investment of Bayonne, &c., from all of which he had the good fortune to escape unwounded. In 1814, having attained the rank of captain, he joined with his regiment the army of the Netherlands, but, owing to an accident which took place a few days before Waterloo, he was unable to take part in the crowning conflict of the war. After the restoration of peace he retired from the army and adopted the life of a country gentleman, taking an active part in all the public affairs of the county of Suffolk. On the death of his father, in 1827, he succeeded to the earldom. In 1844 he was appointed Lord-Lieutenant of his county, and in 1846 he was nominated Vice-Admiral of the coast of Suffolk, both of which high offices he retained to the end of his life. Lord Stradbroke's

estates included some valuable properties in Ireland, and for many years of his life he made it a point to reside a portion of the year in that country, where he was appointed a magistrate for both the counties of Waterford and Tipperary. His chief work, however, was performed in Suffolk, where he was known and respected as an excellent landlord and a tried friend of the agricultural classes. In the early part of his career he became a prominent leader of the movement in the direction of scientific farming, and he was the founder of the Suffolk Agricultural Association, in the progress of which he continued to manifest a lively interest up to the last. He spared no pains by personal example and direct encouragement to make agriculture a remunerative industry, and at the time of his death labourers' allotments, varying from one-eighth to one-quarter of an acre, had existed on his estate for upwards of 40 years. He married, May 26, 1857, Augusta, widow of Colonel Bonham, of the 10th Hussars, and second daughter of the Rev. Sir Christopher John Musgrave, Bart., of Edenhall, Cumberland, by whom he had issue one son, Viscount Dunwich, and five daughters. He died at the family seat of Henham Hall, Suffolk, Jan. 11, being at the time of his death the oldest peer, and, with the exception of the Earl of Chichester, the peer who for the longest time had sat in the House of Lords.

The following deaths also occurred in the same month :—On the 1st, at Goodwood, aged 36, Lord Francis Charles Gordon-Lennox, third son of the sixth Duke of Richmond, and formerly in the Scots Guards. On the 2nd, at Teignmouth, aged 60, Major-General Henry Lowther Chermiside, C.B., the son of Sir Robert Chermiside. He entered the Royal Artillery, and served with distinction in the Crimean campaign. On the same date, at Haipha, in Syria, aged 40, Mrs. Laurence Oliphant, the

<sup>1</sup> These notices are in some cases condensed from the Times.

of the well-known writer, and daughter of Styleman L'Estrange, of Hunstanton, Norfolk. She was herself the author of some papers upon the religious tests held by her husband and herself. On the 3rd, at Alexandria, aged 50, Professor **don Amos**, the English judge of the Native Court of Appeal in Egypt. Called to the Bar of the Inner Temple, he for some time occupied the Chair of Jurisprudence at University College, London. He afterwards passed many years abroad, finishing himself finally in Egypt. On the same date, at Brougham Hall, aged 90, **1 Brougham and Vaux**, the brother of the famous Lord Chancellor, whom by a special extension of the patent he succeeded as second baron. He was called to the Bar, and became a Master in Chancery. At the time of his death he had been for thirty years a Justice of the Peace for Cumberland and Westmoreland, and was also one of the earliest promoters of the Volunteer movement. On the 5th, Philadelphia, aged 70, **Joshua B. Lippincott**, a well-known American publisher, beginning life at 14 as a bookseller's clerk, rose ultimately to a leading position in the Philadelphia book trade. On the same date, at Naples, aged 39, **Vittorio Imbriani**, scholar and profound linguist, celebrated as a brilliant and original writer in various fields of literature. He had fought under Garibaldi. On the 6th, at Angers, aged 75, **M. de Falloux**, one of the last survivors of the Liberal Catholic School. Under Louis Napoleon he was for a time First Minister of Education and Works, resigning under a vote of censure. After the fall of the Empire he warmly attached himself to the project for the restoration of the Monarchy under the Comte de Chambord. He was a member of the Academy, and is best known in literature as the biographer of Madame de Swetchine. On the same date, in Upper St. John's Terrace, aged 69, **Alfred Hanson**, Controller of the Probate, Legacy, and Session Duties, and the author of an able treatise on the law in relation to these subjects. On the 7th, aged 75, **Professor John Morris, F.G.S.** Originally a pharmaceutical chemist in Kensington, he devoted himself to scientific pursuits, and spent many years in preparing a catalogue of British fossils. He held the Chair of Geology at University College for more than twenty years, and on his retirement was made Emeritus Professor. He was an honorary member of numerous local and foreign scientific societies. On the 8th, at Bath, suddenly, aged 76, **Sir George Houstoun-Rowall, of Blackadder, Berwickshire**, son of the late General Sir William Houstoun, G.C.B., first baronet. He served at one time in the Grenadier Guards. He assumed the name of Boswall on marrying the heiress of Thomas Boswall, Esq., of Blackadder. On the same date, at Peterston Rectory, aged 81, **Rev. John Jebb, D.D.**, the rector and a canon of Hereford, the son of the Honourable Mr. Justice Jebb. He was the author of some works on the subjects of cathedrals and their ritual. On the 9th, Langham Place, aged 77, **James Fergusson, C.S.I.**, an architect and historian of architecture, who, beginning life in a mercantile house in Calcutta, made a careful study of Indian architecture, the results of which were made public in his numerous writings on that and other subjects connected with architecture. On the same date, at Nice, aged 73, **Emmanuel Miller**, an hellenist and palæographer of European distinction. On the 10th, aged 70, **Rev. William Gibson Humphrey**, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and for 30 years Vicar of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, where he was well known in his parochial labours. His college life had been a distinguished one, and, in addition to his varied labours as an author, he was a member of the New Testament Revision Company. On the 13th, at Clanricarde Gardens, Bayswater, aged 77, **Sir George Udney-Yule, C.B., K.C.S.I.**, the son of Major William Yule, who, entering the Bengal Civil Service, became Chief Commissioner of Oude, and Political Resident at Hyderabad in the Deccan. On the same date, at Cairo, aged 37, on the reopening of a wound received at the battle of El Teb, whilst serving with the 19th Hussars, **Colonel Percy Harry Stanley Barrow**. In addition to his services in Egypt, he had served in the Zulu campaign of 1879 and elsewhere. On the same date, at Cairo, aged 58, **Lieutenant-Field-Marshal Count Augustus von Belle-Isle**, at one time Adjutant-General of the Emperor of Austria. Also on the same date, Ufford Place, Suffolk, **Francis Capper Brooke**, a magistrate for the county, and late member of the Grenadier Guards. He was the son of the late Rev. Charles Brooke, of Ufford. On the same date, at Barnstaple, aged 93, **Lieutenant-Colonel William Harding**, formerly of 5th Foot, a magistrate for Devon, who in his youth had served in the Peninsular War. He was also the author of a learned and elaborate work on the history of Tiverton. On the 15th, at Upton Park, Slough, aged 75, **General Sir John Grant, K.C.B.**, honorary colonel of 2nd battalion Connaught Rangers. Son of Captain W. C. Grant, of 92nd Highlanders, he served in China and throughout the Crimean campaign of 1854-55. On the 16th, at St. John's Wood, aged 38, **ph Mass**, a celebrated concert singer. He received his early instruction

choir boy in Rochester Cathedral, before studying in Milan. On the same date, at Döbling, aged 52, **Ottokar Franz Ebersberg**, the author of innumerable comedies and farces published under the pseudonym of Berg. He was the founder, and until shortly before his death the editor, of the Viennese comic paper *Kikeriki*. Also on the same date, at Milan, aged 52, **Amilcare Ponchielli**, a well-known Italian composer, whose name is best known in England by his opera of *Gioconda*. Also on the same date, aged 65, **Rev. William Kay**, rector of Great Leigh, Essex, and honorary canon of St. Albans; sometime Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford; for sixteen years principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and an author of some repute. Also on the same date, at Constantinople, aged 72, **Sabhi Pasha**, who, inheriting a princely fortune, devoted it to the promotion of literature and science. He was a writer upon numismatics and statistics, and was an honorary member of various English and French statistical societies. On the 17th, aged 57, **Paul Baudry**, an eminent artist, who devoted nearly ten years to the decoration of the new Opera House at Paris. On the 18th, aged 66, **Rev. Dr. Conaty**, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Kilmore. On the 19th, at Prior Park, Bath, aged 81, **Archbishop Errington**, previously Roman Catholic Bishop of Plymouth. On the same date, at Bevington, Cheshire, aged 82, **Joseph Mayer, F.S.A.**, well known as the possessor of a collection of antiquities, which he presented to the Corporation Museum of Liverpool. He was originally a jeweller and silversmith, and his name is associated with the introduction of electro-plating. Also on the same date, aged 77, **Michael Czajkowski**, a celebrated Polish novelist. When a convert to Islamism he acquired—under the name of Sadyk Pasha—some military reputation in the Turkish Army during the Crimean War. He afterwards joined the Greek Orthodox Church, and became reconciled to Russia, living in retirement, and writing in Russian newspapers as an apostle of Pan Slavism. On the 21st, at The Binns, Linlithgow, aged 65, **Sir Robert Alexander Osborne Dalyell, F.R.G.S.**, the son of Sir William Dalyell, R.N., whom he succeeded as eighth baronet in 1865. In 1857-58 he was attached to Sir H. Bulwer's Mission in the Danubian Principalities, and was afterwards Consul at Belgrade, Erzeroum, and Jassy. On the same date, at Hampstead, aged 71, **Joseph Hoare**, of Child's Hill House, Hampstead, and of Cromer, Norfolk, son of Samuel Hoare, banker, of London, and himself for many years a partner in that well-known firm. Also on the same date, at Leslie House, Fife, N.B., aged 83, **Louisa Dowager Countess of Rothes**, the widow of eleventh Earl of Rothes, and daughter of Colonel H. A. Morshead, of Widey Court, Devon. Also on the same date, at Méran, aged 70, **Princess Mathilda of Thurn and Taxis**, the widow of Prince Maximilian, and a daughter of a Prince of Oettingen-Spielberg. On the 22nd, in Dublin, **Duchesse de Saldanha**, lady of honour to the Queen of Portugal, and widow of Field-Marshal the Duc de Saldanha, many years the Portuguese Minister at the Court of St. James. On the 23rd, at St. Leonards-on-Sea, aged 81, **General Sir William Sherbrooke Ramsay Norcott, K.C.B.**, Colonel-Commandant of the Rifle Brigade, and formerly Governor of Jersey. A son of Sir Amos Norcott, G.C.H., C.B., he specially distinguished himself for gallantry in the Crimean War. On the same date, at Strathallan Castle, Perthshire, aged 75, **William Henry Drummond, Viscount Strathallan**, a representative peer for Scotland. Succeeded his father as seventh viscount in 1851, and at one time was a lord-in-waiting to the Queen. On the 24th, at West Grinstead Park, Sussex, aged 71, **Sir Walter Wyndham Burrell**, third baronet, for some time M.P. for New Shoreham, Grand Master of the Sussex Province of Freemasons. On the same date, at Venice, **Sebastiano Tecchio**, one of the survivors of the group of distinguished men who laid the foundations of Italian Unity. He was in 1866 made a Senator of the Kingdom, and was President of the Senate from Nov. 1876 to May 1884. He was created a Knight of the Supreme Order of the Annunziata by King Humbert in 1878. On the 25th, at Berlin, aged 69, **Friedrich Oskar von Schwarze**, one of the greatest of modern German jurists. A Saxon by birth, the chief work of his life was performed in that kingdom; but since 1867, as a member of the Reichstag, his services were given to law reform throughout Germany. On the 26th, at St. Asaph, aged 70, **Venerable Henry Powell Foulkes**, Archdeacon of Montgomery, Canon-Residentiary of St. Asaph's, and Rector of Whittington, near Oswestry. On the 27th, at Oxford, aged 75, **Edward Hartopp Cradock, D.D.**, Principal of Brasenose College, and sometime Canon-Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral.

FEBRUARY.

**General Hancock, U.S.A.**—Scott Hancock was born in Perry County, Pennsylvania, in 1846, having studied at the Military Academy of West Point, he entered the service as a lieutenant of infantry in 1866, though the Mexican War and taking part in the Florida campaign against the Seminole Indians. At the break of the Civil War in 1861 he was appointed a brigadier-general of volunteers and joined the army of the Potomac under General McClellan. He fought through all the hard campaigns and fierce fighting of McClellan's army on the York Peninsula, and of the subsequent retreat to the left bank of the James River. He specially distinguished himself in the engagement at Antietam, and, under General Halleck, had superseded McClellan, and commanded a division in the battle of Fredericksburg. He took part also in the battle of Gettysburg, and at Gettysburg he was wounded which disabled him for some time. After a partial recovery he resumed command of his division, and fought upon the Wilderness campaign in 1864, but was compelled by his wounds to withdraw and devote himself to the end of the war to less active military services, however, he had fought as one of the able soldiers of the United States army, and from the end of the war till his death he was employed in high military positions. Of these the last and most important was that of the command of the Department of the Potomac, to which he was appointed although an active Democrat by the Republican President, Grant, in 1872. At the presidential election of 1880 he was chosen by the Democratic Convention as their candidate in opposition to General Garfield, and was defeated by 59 votes. He was, though the electoral struggle, respected and regarded even from his opponents. General Hancock took no part in public life beyond that connected with his command. He had his official residence at Governor's Palace, New York Harbour, on the 9th,

St. Randolph. — Randolph was one of the most original and of modern English humorous writers, born, in 1846, at Chester and

educated at Henry VIII.'s School, in that city. He began life as a clerk in a bank, first at Whitechurch and subsequently at Manchester. His earliest attempts at writing attracted little notice beyond the circle of his immediate friends, and even his first published illustrations in "London Society" met with little attention from the public. It was as a book illustrator that he first obtained celebrity, his first great success being a series of illustrations to Washington Irving's "Old Christmas," published in 1875, this work being followed the next year by "Bracebridge Hall." The invention, humour, and admirable drawing of the vignettes and borders with which the volumes were embellished at once attracted notice, and secured for the artist ample and remunerative employment. In 1877 he illustrated the "North Italian Folk" of Mrs. Comyns Carr, and two years later there appeared his illustrations of the "Breton Folk" of Mr. H. Blackburn. It was not, however, until 1878 that he displayed the full extent of his powers in the drawings made for the coloured "Picture Books," the first of the series including "John Gilpin," "The House that Jack Built," and "A Frog he would a Wooing Go," being perhaps the best of his productions. In these works, in addition to the feeling previously displayed for village scenery and architecture, he revealed a talent for animal drawing pervaded in every line with the most exquisite humour. He succeeded as no other artist had previously in giving to the subjects of his pencil the most characteristic qualities of humanity, but it was in his delineation of dogs that he displayed his greatest genius while preserving their own. From this time up to the date of his death, in spite of failing health and waning strength, his pencil was never idle. Besides the series of nursery tales and rhymes with which his name will be ever connected, he contributed frequently both drawings and letterpress to the *Graphic* and other illustrated papers; he published a "Sketch Book" (1883) and a new edition of "Æsop's Fables," besides illustrating a number of works for other authors and producing pictures for exhibition. In 1880 he was elected a member of the Manchester Academy of Arts, and was one of the originally elected members of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours.



In November of 1885 he left England in order to avoid the cold season, but his work had detained him so long that his voyage across the Atlantic was most trying to a constitution already enfeebled. For some weeks he was unable to be removed from New York, and when he could be taken south it was too late. After a slight rally he died on the 12th, at St. Augustine, Florida.

**Principal Tulloch.**—The Very Rev. John Tulloch, D.D., LL.D., senior Principal of St. Andrews University, who died at Torquay on the 13th, was born near Tippermuir, in Perthshire, in 1823, where his father had for many years been minister of the parish. He entered the United College of St. Salvador and St. Leonard, St. Andrews, in 1837, and after completing his literary and philosophical studies there he passed into the College of St. Mary as a student of theology, the college of which he afterwards became Principal. In 1845 he was ordained a minister to a church in Dundee, whence in 1849 he removed to Kittina, Forfarshire. In 1854, at the early age of 31, he succeeded Principal Haldane both as the head of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, and as Professor of Divinity, receiving at the same time the degree of D.D. In the discharge of the duties of the twofold office he spent the remainder of his years, working up to within a few months of his death. His collegiate duties left him a large amount of leisure, which he turned to account with characteristic energy. An eloquent preacher, his services were always welcomed in the chief pulpits of Scotland, but his chief devotion was to literary work, and in this department he obtained a wide popularity. He first attracted attention as a contributor to the *British Quarterly Review* and the *North British Review*, becoming afterwards also a contributor to the *Edinburgh* and the *Contemporary Reviews*. His name was first made familiar to English scholars by his obtaining in 1855 the second Burnett prize for an essay on "The Being and Attributes of God," afterwards published under the title of "Theism." He was the author of many other works, the chief of which are "The Leaders of the Reformation" (1859); "English Puritanism and its Leaders" (1861); and "Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century" (2 vols., 1872). In the public business of his own church he took a prominent part. He was for many years one of the clerks of the General Assembly, and in 1878 he was raised to the Moderator's Chair, his

graceful and genial manners eminently qualifying him to fill such public offices. In his views of Church matters he was large-hearted and liberal, his character in this respect procuring for him the friendship of Dean Stanley and other prominent men in the Church of England. He was a Liberal in politics, but owing to the pressing of the movement for disestablishment he withdrew in 1885 from active participation in political affairs. In addition to his other offices Principal Tulloch was one of the Deans of the Chapel Royal, and Dean of the Order of the Thistle.

**Viscount Cardwell.**—The Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, whose death took place at Torquay on the 15th, was the son of John Cardwell, an eminent Liverpool merchant. He was born July 24, 1812, and educated at Winchester, where in 1832 he gained the Balliol scholarship. He graduated in 1835, taking a double first degree (classics and mathematics), and soon afterwards was elected Fellow of his college. He was called to the Bar in 1838, but shortly afterwards abandoned law for politics, and in 1842 entered Parliament as Conservative member for Clitheroe. In the financial changes of 1845-46 he supported Sir Robert Peel, and in 1845 was appointed Secretary of the Treasury. In 1847 he was elected member for his native town of Liverpool, a position he retained until 1852, but which he lost in the general election of that year. In Jan. 1853 he was returned for the city of Oxford, but four years later was beaten in the contest of March 1857. When, however, one of his opponents was unseated on petition he again offered himself, and was elected in the July of the same year. He continued to represent Oxford from this time until Feb. 1874, when he was elevated by Mr. Gladstone to the peerage. On the formation of the Coalition Ministry under Lord Aberdeen in 1852 Mr. Cardwell became President of the Board of Trade without a seat in the Cabinet, his tenure of office being marked by the introduction of some useful and valuable reforms, while he displayed considerable ability as a speaker on the various questions that arose during his administration. After the fall of the ministry in 1855 Mr. Cardwell remained a private member until 1859, when he accepted office under Lord Palmerston, becoming Chief Secretary for Ireland with a seat in the Cabinet, which post he held until July 1861, when he became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. In March

1864 he succeeded the Duke of Newcastle as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and held the same appointment under Earl Russell's administration until 1866. It was during his administration of the Colonial Department that the riots in Jamaica took place, the severe repression of which by Governor Eyre gave rise to much excitement in England. The measures adopted by Mr. Cardwell for dealing with the subject, though they failed to satisfy the extreme partisans of either side, yet commanded the general approval of the nation, and in the end resulted in the abolition of the Jamaica legislature and the placing of the island as a Crown Colony under Sir J. P. Grant. In Dec. 1868, on the formation of Mr. Gladstone's first Cabinet, Mr. Cardwell became Secretary of State for War, and a member of the Committee of the Council on Education. He remained at the head of the War Office during the trying time covered by the Franco-German War, and after its close he achieved the greatest undertaking of his public career in the introduction and passing through the House of Commons of the famous measure for the reorganisation of the British Army. The chief features of this important statute were the abolition of purchase, the introduction of the short service

system of enlistment, the transference of the control of the auxiliary forces from the lords lieutenant to the Crown, the localisation of regiments, the creation of a system of military centre from which a considerable increase to the numbers of the effective army, the reserves, and the militia was anticipated. The Army Regulation Bill, after passing successfully the most determined opposition in the House of Commons, was made the subject of hostile amendment in the House of Lords, and defeated, but its objects were secured by the use of the Royal Warrant obtained by Mr. Gladstone. When the Liberals quitted office in 1874 Mr. Cardwell was raised to the peerage by the title of Viscount Cardwell, and though his public services were no longer as prominent as formerly he continued to serve his country and party in the House of Lords for several years until prevented by the illness to which, after some years of struggle, he eventually succumbed. Lord Cardwell was one of the literary executors of the will of Sir Robert Peel, and conjointly with Earl Stanhope he edited the *Memoirs of that statesman* (2 vols., 1856). He married in 1838 Miss Annie Parker, youngest daughter of Mr. Charles Stewart Parker, of Fairlie, Ayrshire.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 1st, at South Norwood Hill, aged 79, Admiral the Right Hon. Plantagenet Pierrepont, Viscount Falkland in the peerage of Scotland, and Baron Hunsdon in that of the United Kingdom. The son of the ninth viscount, he succeeded his brother as eleventh Viscount Falkland in 1884. He entered the royal navy in 1820, and served in the Burmese War. On the same date, in St. George's Square, London, aged 65, Lord Saltoun, son of Fraser, third son of the fifteenth baron. He succeeded his uncle, the distinguished general, as seventeenth baron in 1853, having himself early in life served in the army. He was for some time Lieutenant-Colonel of the Aberdeenshire Militia, and a representative peer for Scotland. On the 2nd, aged 65, Hugh Mason, of Groby Hall, for some years M.P. for Ashton-under-Lyne, the son of a manufacturer of Stalybridge. On the same date, at Cannes, aged 30, Prince Leopold, the eldest son of the Duke of Anhalt. On the 3rd, at Corbally House, aged 70, Dr. George Butler, Roman Catholic Bishop of Limerick, a warm supporter of the Parnellite policy. He had passed some years in missionary service in the West Indies. On the 4th, at Paris, aged 47, Comte de St. Vallier, a member of the French Senate, and first Ambassador at Berlin after the Franco-German War. On the same date, at St. Scholastica's Priory, Atherstone, Warwickshire, aged 33, Lady Margaret Matilda Dundas, daughter of the Hon. J. C. Dundas, and sister of the third Earl of Zetland. Also on the same date, at Thorncroft, Leatherhead, aged 81, Dowager Marchioness of Cholmondeley, widow of the third marquis, and daughter of the sixth Duke of Beaufort, K.G. On the 5th, at Booterdown, near Dublin, aged 85, Richard Robert Madden, F.R.C.S., formerly Colonial Secretary of Western Australia. He was the son of a Dublin merchant, and began life in the medical profession. From his connection as a special magistrate with Jamaica, he took great interest in the movement for the abolition of the slave trade in various parts. As Commissioner of Inquiry on the West Coast of Africa, he rendered valuable services to the cause. He was the author of some biographical and other works. On the same date, at Queen's Gardens, London, aged 67, John Bridges Aysall, B.C., Recorder of Liverpool, and Attorney-General for the County Pal-

tine of Durham. The son of the Rev. James Aspinall, Rector of Althorpe, he was called to the Bar in 1841, and attained a wide reputation as a criminal lawyer. On the 7th, at Rome, aged 85, **Alessandro Torlonia**, Prince of Civitella Casci, &c., the son of G. Torlonio, a banker, who, beginning life as a travelling tinker, became Duke of Bracciano. He soon largely increased his patrimony by profitable transactions, and became the greatest capitalist in Italy. He used his vast wealth in making extensive excavations of ancient sites, and the most remarkable of his public enterprises was the successful draining at an enormous expense of Lake Fucino, thereby recovering for agriculture 16,000 acres of land. For this service he was created, by Victor Emmanuel, Prince of Fucino. On the same date, at Brookheath, near Salisbury, aged 74, **General William Neville Custance**, C.B., Colonel of 11th Hussars, son of the late H. T. Custance, of Weston House, Norfolk. He served with distinction both in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns. On the 8th, suddenly, at Moscow, aged 62, **Ivan Sergeivich Aksakoff**, editor of the *Russ* newspaper, well known as one of the chief leaders of the Panslavist movement. The son of Serge Timofeivitch Aksakoff, a Russian author of repute, he began his career in the Moscow Senate, passing subsequently into the Ministry of the Interior. He served as a volunteer in the Crimean War, and, returning to Moscow in 1859, began a literary life as editor of the Russian *Besieda*. On the 9th, at Kensington, aged 73, **Edward Thomas**, F.R.S., C.I.E., a distinguished numismatist, whose study of the coins of India has greatly contributed to the knowledge of early Indian history. The son of an eminent surgeon, he went out in the civil service to India, and after his retirement devoted himself to the study of the antiquities and history of that empire. On the 10th, at Leslie House, Fifeshire, aged 53, **Henrietta Anderson Mordaunt Waldegrave Leslie**, Countess of Rothes, daughter of the fourteenth Earl of Rothes. She, on the death of her brother, without issue, in 1859, succeeded to the title, and in 1861 she married Hon. George Waldegrave Leslie, the son of eighth Earl of Waldegrave. On the 11th, aged 54, **Henry Bradshaw**, M.A., Librarian of the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of King's College. Noted for his great knowledge of fourteenth and fifteenth century literature, he possessed a unique knowledge of the characteristics of the printers of the fifteenth century. On the 12th, aged 72, **Jules Janin**, the permanent secretary for the section of Physics and Natural History of the French Academy of Science. He was a writer on scientific subjects, and in his latter years had devoted his chief attention to electro-magnetism and the electric light. On the 12th, aged 76, **Horatio Seymour**, an eminent American statesman, who had been twice Governor of New York State, and, refusing a nomination for the Presidency, devoted himself to agricultural and social study and writing. His sterling integrity and kindly wisdom had earned for him the sobriquet of "the sage of Deerfield." On the 14th, in Carlton Gardens, aged 85, **Right Hon. George Cecil Weld Forester**, second Baron Forester of Willey Park, Shropshire. He entered the army at an early age, and reached the rank of general. He sat in the House of Commons from 1828 to 1874 for Wenlock, and from 1858-59 was Controller of the Queen's Household. On the 15th, in Audley Square, aged 74, **Robert Alexander Shafto Adair**, Baron Waveney, F.R.S. He was the eldest son of the late Sir R. Shafto Adair, whom he succeeded as second baronet, and was raised to the peerage in 1873, the title becoming extinct on his death. For many years he had been the acknowledged head and guide of the Ulster Liberals, and was Lord-Lieutenant of co. Antrim. On the 16th, at Florence, aged 72, **Sir Joseph Arnould**, of White Cross, near Wallingford, son of Joseph Arnould, M.D. For many years he was puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Bombay, where a scholarship in his name was founded at the University by the native community. On the 18th, at Philadelphia, aged 68, **John B. Gough**, who during the course of his career as a temperance orator delivered 9,000 lectures in America and in England. A native of Sandgate, Kent, he was sent to the United States at the age of twelve in the charge of a family emigrating from his village. He was an orator of wonderful power, and he rendered immense service to the cause of temperance in America. On the same date, at Ramsgate, aged 82, **Robert Dundas**, Viscount Melville, Baron Duneira, in the peerage of the United Kingdom. He succeeded his brother as third viscount in 1876, and was Storekeeper General of the Navy. Also on the same date, at Vienna, aged 70, **Joseph Aigners**, a portrait painter of some celebrity, who, as commandant of the insurgent Academy Legion in the revolution of 1848, had been sentenced to death, but was afterwards pardoned. On the 20th, in Brook Street, Grosvenor Square, aged 82, **George William Pierrepont Bentinck**, of Terrington, St. Clement, Norfolk, for many years M.P. for West Norfolk. He was the son of the late Vice-Admiral William Bentinck, and was long

regarded as the most uncompromising supporter of the old Protectionist policy. On the 25th, aged 84, **Miss Charlotte Grant**, daughter of Colonel Grant, R.E., and formerly governess to the Queen of the Belgians. Residing in Hungary during the rebellion of 1848, she was on friendly terms with the most remarkable men of the time and country. On the 28th, aged 66, **Lieutenant-General Thomas Fourness Wilson, C.B.**, late Military Member of the Viceregal Council, and an officer who had greatly distinguished himself during the Indian Mutiny in the defence of Lucknow. On the same date, at Ford Park, Newton Abbot, Devon, aged 64, **General Reynell George Taylor, C.B., C.S.I.**, son of Major-General J. W. Taylor, C.B., of West Oghen, Devon. On entering the Bengal army, he served in the Gwalior, Butlej, and Punjab campaigns, and was some time in command of the Umritsir division in the Punjab. Also on the same date, at Edinburgh, aged 85, **Charles William Peach**, who in early life had occupied a subordinate position in the coastguard service. When stationed at Cromer his attention was attracted by the remains of extinct mammalia in the neighbouring cliffs, and from this was led to the study of zoology and palæontology. His researches and discoveries added much to the store of knowledge on these subjects. Also on the same date, aged 90, **Conway Richard Dobbs, D.L.**, of Castle Dobbs, co. Antrim. At an early age he entered the royal navy, where he fought under Lord Exmouth at Algiers, but, quitting the navy, he subsequently represented Carrickfergus in Parliament for a short time in 1832, and then retired to private but useful life.

## MARCH.

**Earl of Chichester.**—The Right Hon. Henry Thomas Pelham, Earl of Chichester, and Baron Pelham of Stanmer, Sussex, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, and a baronet, who died on the 15th at his seat, Stanmer Park, Lewes, was the eldest surviving son of Thomas, second earl, by his marriage with Lady Mary Henrietta Osborne, eldest daughter of Francis, fifth Duke of Leeds. He was born April 25, 1804, and was educated at Westminster School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1824 he entered the Royal Horse Guards, becoming a captain (unattached) in 1828, and retiring as major in 1844. He succeeded as third earl on the death of his father in July 1826. In 1847 Lord Chichester was appointed by Parliament one of the Commissioners to report on the equalisation of Bishoprics in point of pecuniary value, and he was afterwards one of the Commissioners of Pentonville Prison. In 1850, on the creation of the Church Estates Committee, he was appointed a member, and he retained the important office of First Church Estates Commission for 28 years, until October 1878, retaining, however, his earlier appointment as Ecclesiastical Commissioner made in 1841. In 1860 Lord Chichester was appointed Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotarum of the county of Sussex. A member of the Evangelical School of the Church of England, he took from an early period in life and active part in the *patronage and management of many of*

its leading religious and charitable societies, and he was frequently associated with Lord Shaftesbury at the Annual May Meetings at Exeter Hall. He married in Aug. 1828 Lady Mary Brudenell, fifth daughter of Robert, sixth Earl of Cardigan, by whom he had a family of four sons and three daughters.

**Comtesse de Chambord.**—Marie Thérèse Béatrice Gaëtane, Archduchess of Austria-Este, was the eldest daughter of Francis V., Duke of Modena, and was born July 14, 1817. She was married to Henri de Bourbon, Duc de Bordeaux and Comte de Chambord, at Brück on the Mur, in 1846. She brought her husband a large fortune, and during the early years of their married life took only a passive interest in the schemes directed, first against the Government of Louis Philippe, and afterwards against the Republic. She had, however, but little faith in the political devices of the Legitimists, being inclined by her deeply religious temperament to place her trust only in Heaven and hope for a time when the French nation, having turned penitent, would recall its rightful king to the throne by acclamation. When it became evident that she would never become a mother she abandoned all desire to reign, a life interest in a throne to be afterwards abandoned to the Orleans family, for whom she had the greatest antipathy, being a prize of very small value in her eyes. After the death of the Comte



de Chambord, Aug. 24, 1883, she devoted herself entirely to devotion and works of charity. She died at Görz on the 25th.

**Archbishop Trench.**—Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., who died in Eaton Square, London, after a lingering illness, on the 28th, was born Sept. 9, 1807. He was the second son of Mr. Richard Trench, brother of the first Lord Ashtown, in the Irish peerage, his mother, a lady of high mental culture, being the granddaughter and heiress of Dr. Richard Chenevix, Bishop of Waterford. He graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1829, and entering holy orders was ordained to a curacy under Hugh James Rose, at Hadleigh, Suffolk. In 1832 he married his cousin, the Hon. Frances Mary Trench, sister of Lord Ashtown, by whom he had a numerous family. He subsequently became incumbent of Curdridge, a chapelry in the parish of Bishop's Waltham, Hants, where he remained until 1841. In 1835 appeared his earliest work, "The Story of Justin Martyr, and other Poems," which was very well received, and was succeeded in 1838 by "Sabbation, Honor Neale, and other Poems," which further increased his reputation as a poet. About this time he first became acquainted with Samuel Wilberforce, and the acquaintanceship soon ripened into intimate friendship. In 1841 Mr. Trench gave up his incumbency at Curdridge and accepted a curacy under Archdeacon Wilberforce at Alverstoke, where he remained until 1845, when he was presented to the rectory of Itchen Stoke, Hants. In 1845 and 1846 he was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge, and subsequently one of the University Select Preachers. When Dr. Wilberforce became Bishop of Oxford he appointed Dr. Trench his examining chaplain, and a short time later Dr. Trench became Theological Professor and Examiner at King's College, London. This appointment he resigned in 1856, when, on the death of Dr. Buckland, he was preferred to the deanery of Westminster. Meantime he had followed up the volumes of poetry previously referred to by numerous works in poetry and prose, by which his fame as an author had become firmly established. In poetry his chief productions had been "Elegiac Poems," "Poems from Eastern Sources," "Geneva, and other Poems," and "Sacred Poems for Mourners"; while his prose works included "Notes on the Parables," "Notes on the Miracles," numerous sermons and lectures, and a small volume, which obtained great popu-

larity, "On the Study of Words." In 1853 he published a volume "On the Lessons in Proverbs"; in 1854, "Synonyms of the New Testament," and "Alma, and other Poems"; and the following year, "English, Past and Present." From 1858 he interested himself in the question of the revision of the New Testament, and when, a few years afterwards, the "Speaker's Commentary" was projected, he was appointed one of the editors. In 1863, on the death of Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench was appointed to the vacant see, which, with general approval, he occupied during a long and eventful period. In common with his episcopal brethren, he resisted Mr. Gladstone's scheme for the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland, but when the measure of the latter became law Archbishop Trench took an active and leading part in its consequent reconstruction. After twenty-one years' tenure of his important office he was forced by ill-health, in November 1884, to resign his important office.

By his numerous works Dr. Trench gained for himself no inconsiderable place in English literature, while he left behind him an enduring reputation for uniform courtesy and gentleness, absolute integrity of purpose, great self-abnegation and benevolence, and deep devotion to the Church of which he was so conspicuous an ornament.

**Sir Henry Taylor.**—Sir Henry Taylor, who died at his residence, The Roost, Bournemouth, on the 27th, was the son of Mr. George Taylor, of Wotton Hall, Durham, and was born in the year 1800. He was educated by his father, and, entering the public service as a junior clerk in the Colonial Office in 1824, was made a senior clerk in 1825. His connection with this department he retained for 48 years, during which period he enjoyed the friendship of many of the most distinguished men of his time, and when he retired in 1872 he had served under no fewer than twenty-six Colonial Secretaries. At an early period he devoted his attention to literature, and in 1827 published his first work, a poetic drama, entitled "Isaac Comnenus." This failed to achieve success, but in 1834 he followed it with "Philip van Artwede," the merits of which at once obtained recognition, and which most critics regard as his masterpiece. In 1836 he published a prose work entitled "The Statesman," a collection of thirty-four essays, embodying views



and maxims of a practical character for the benefit of those aspiring to public life. Some portions of this work were made the subject of much hostile criticism, that which the author had designed to be a sarcastic comment on certain of the ways of the world being mistaken for his sincere recommendation of the practices referred to.

In 1842 he again appeared as a dramatic poet, with "Edwin the Fair, an Historical Drama," and in 1847 he published "The Eve of the Conquest, and other Poems," and a prose work entitled "Notes from Life, in six Essays." In 1850 he issued "The

Sicilian Summer," and in 1862 "St. Clement's Eve." In 1869 Sir Henry Taylor was created a K.C.M.G., in recognition of his long official services in connection with the colonies, and the University of Oxford conferred upon him the honorary degree of D.C.L. In 1885 he published his "Autobiography," containing interesting reminiscences of the friends of his long life, and offering the materials for the biography of one who occupied a prominent position in English society and letters during the greater part of the nineteenth century.

The following deaths also occurred during the month :—On the 1st, aged 62, Sir John Harpur-Crewe, of Calke Abbey, Derbyshire, ninth baronet. On the same date, at Meadowbank, Melksham, Wilts, aged 72, Admiral Sir Charles Frederick Alexander Shadwell, son of the Right Hon. Sir Lancelot Shadwell, Vice-Chancellor of England. He entered the royal navy in 1827, took part in the Burmese and Chinese Wars, and was some time Commander-in-Chief in China, and afterwards President of the Royal Naval College at Greenwich. Also on the same date, Prince George Okropiroviah Grushnsky, the last male descendant of the dynasty of Georgia. He enjoyed a life pension from Alexander II., and the last few years of his life were devoted to literary studies. On the 3rd, at Naples, Captain J. J. Kendall. He entered the army in 1854, and served in the Crimea and in India. He subsequently held a command in the army of the Emperor Maximilian in Mexico, and he acted in various offices under the Colonial Office in Sierra Leone and the West African Settlements. On the 4th, at Christchurch Spa, Gloucester, aged 96, Captain James Maurice Shipton, R.N., who, entering the navy in 1803, had served under Nelson, Duncan, &c. On the 5th, at Ipswich, aged 55, R. C. Ransome, as the head of the Great Orwell Works, of Ransome, Sims, and Head. He took an active part in the introduction of Fowler's steam plough. On the 6th, at Monte Carlo, aged 36, Viscount Dupplin, eldest son of the Earl of Kinnoull. Formerly in 1st Life Guards. On the same date, John Storrar, M.D., ex-Chairman of Convocation of the London University. He was appointed to represent the University at the General Medical Council on its first formation, and subsequently devoted his entire time and attention to its interests. Also on the same date, at Brook Green, aged 52, General Bouverie Goddard, an animal and landscape painter, who commenced his career by drawing on wood sporting sketches for *Punch* and other illustrated periodicals. On the 7th, at Brighton, aged 91, Daniel Pryor Hack, a member of the Society of Friends. So staunch in his principles that when in early life drawn for the militia he suffered imprisonment rather than serve or find a substitute. On the 8th, aged 62, on board the *Minotaur*, Vice-Admiral Charles Fellowes, C.B., in command of the Channel Squadron. He was the son of Admiral Sir Thomas Fellowes, and had served in Burmah and in China. On the same date, in London, aged 64, Sir William James Wheelhouse, Q.C., formerly M.P. for Leeds. The son of the late James Wheelhouse, surgeon, of Snaith, Yorkshire, he was called to the Bar of Gray's Inn, and as treasurer received the honour of knighthood at the opening of the Royal Courts of Justice. Also on the same date, at The Elms, Market Harborough, aged 84, Sir William De Capell-Brooke, younger son of Sir Richard De Capell-Brooke, succeeding his brother as third baronet. On the 9th, at the Vicarage, Kirkby Stephen, aged 66, Rev. Canon Simpson, LL.D., F.S.A. Was President of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian Society, and Chairman of Quarter Sessions. On the same date, at Didsbury, aged 63, Rev. John Dury-Geden, D.D., a well-known Hebrew scholar, a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and for some time professor at the Wesleyan Theological College, Didsbury. On the 10th, at Sullington Hall, Derbyshire, aged 71, Charles Robert Colville, formerly M.P. for South Derbyshire, and colonel of Yeomanry. He was the head of a family which had been settled in Cambridgeshire since the Conquest, and succeeded to the estates on the death of his father, Sir Charles Colville. On the 12th, at Egmont, Bracknell, Berkshire, aged 69, General Sir Trevor Cauter, K.C.B., colonel of the 22nd Cheshire Regiment. He had served in the Indian

choir boy in Rochester Cathedral, before studying in Milan. On the same day, aged 52, **Ottokar Franz Ebersberg**, the author of innumerable comic farces published under the pseudonym of Berg. He was the founder, shortly before his death the editor, of the Viennese comic paper *Kikeri*. On the same date, at Milan, aged 52, **Amilcare Ponchielli**, a well-known composer, whose name is best known in England by his opera of *La Gioconda*. Also on the same date, aged 65, **Rev. William Kay**, rector of Great Ouse, Essex, and honorary canon of St. Albans; sometime Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford; for sixteen years principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta, and of some repute. Also on the same date, at Constantinople, aged 71, **Sadyk Pasha**, who, inheriting a princely fortune, devoted it to the promotion of literature and science. He was a writer upon numismatics and statistics, an honorary member of various English and French statistical societies. On the 17th, aged 57, **Paul Baudry**, an eminent artist, who devoted nearly ten years to the decoration of the new Opera House at Paris. On the 18th, aged 66, **Rev. Dr. John Henry Newman**, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham. On the 19th, at Prior Park, Bath, **Archbishop Errington**, previously Roman Catholic Bishop of Plymouth. On the same date, at Bevington, Cheshire, aged 82, **Joseph Mayer, F.S.A.**, well known as a possessor of a collection of antiquities, which he presented to the Cottonian Museum of Liverpool. He was originally a jeweller and silversmith, and is associated with the introduction of electro-plating. Also on the same date, **Michael Czajkowski**, a celebrated Polish novelist. When a convert to Christianity, he acquired—under the name of Sadyk Pasha—some military reputation in the Turkish Army during the Crimean War. He afterwards joined the Greek Church, and became reconciled to Russia, living in retirement, and writing for Russian newspapers as an apostle of Slavism. On the 21st, at The Balmaghie, Glasgow, aged 65, **Sir Robert Alexander Osborne Dalrymple, F.R.G.S.**, the son of **William Dalrymple, R.N.**, whom he succeeded as eighth baronet in 1865. In 1848 he was attached to Sir H. Bulwer's Mission in the Danubian Principalities, and was afterwards Consul at Belgrade, Erzeroum, and Jassy. On the same date, at 17, Bedford Square, aged 71, **Joseph Hoare**, of Child's Hill House, Hampstead, and of Croft House, Norfolk, son of Samuel Hoare, banker, of London, and himself for many years a partner in that well-known firm. Also on the same date, at Leslie House, Fife, N.B., **Louisa Dowager Countess of Rothes**, the widow of eleventh Earl of Rothes, and daughter of Colonel H. A. Morshead, of Widey Court, Devon. Also on the same date, at Méran, aged 70, **Princess Mathilda of Thurn and Taxis**, the widow of Prince of Thurn and Taxis, and a daughter of a Prince of Oettingen-Spielberg. On the 22nd, at 17, Bedford Square, **Duchesse de Saldanha**, lady of honour to the Queen of Portugal, and widow of Marshal the Duc de Saldanha, many years the Portuguese Minister at the Court of St. James. On the 23rd, at St. Leonards-on-Sea, aged 81, **General Sir Sherbrooke Ramsay Norcott, K.C.B.**, Colonel-Commandant of the Rifle Brigade, and formerly Governor of Jersey. A son of Sir Amos Norcott, G.C.H., C.B., who specially distinguished himself for gallantry in the Crimean War. On the same date, at Strathallan Castle, Perthshire, aged 75, **William Henry Drummond, Viscount of Strathallan**, a representative peer for Scotland. Succeeded his father as seventh Viscount in 1851, and at one time was a lord-in-waiting to the Queen. On the 24th, at Grinstead Park, Sussex, aged 71, **Sir Walter Wyndham Burrell**, third baronet, for some time M.P. for New Shoreham, Grand Master of the Sussex Provincial Freemasons. On the same date, at Venice, **Sebastiano Tecchio**, one of the survivors of the group of distinguished men who laid the foundations of Italian Unity. He was in 1866 made a Senator of the Kingdom, and was President of the Senate from Nov. 1876 to May 1884. He was created a Knight of the Supreme Order of the *Annunziata* by King Humbert in 1878. On the 25th, at Berlin, aged 69, **Oskar von Schwarze**, one of the greatest of modern German jurists. Born in Prussia by birth, the chief work of his life was performed in that kingdom; but in 1867, as a member of the Reichstag, his services were given to law reform in Germany. On the 26th, at St. Asaph, aged 70, **Venerable Henry Powell**, formerly Archdeacon of Montgomery, Canon-Residentiary of St. Asaph's, and formerly of Ely, Whittington, near Oswestry. On the 27th, at Oxford, aged 75, **Edward Cradock, D.D.**, Principal of Brasenose College, and sometime Canon-Residentiary of Worcester Cathedral.

FEBRUARY.

**General Hancock, U.S.A.**—Scott Hancock was born in York County, Pennsylvania, in 1846, having studied at the Military Academy of West Point, he entered the service as a lieutenant of infantry in 1866, through the Mexican War and taking part in the Florida campaign against the Seminole Indians. At the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861 he was appointed a brigadier-general of volunteers and joined the army of the Potomac under General McClellan. He fought through all the hard campaigns and fierce fighting of McClellan's army on the York Peninsula, and of the subsequent retreat to the left bank of the James River. He specially distinguished himself in the engagement at Antietam, and, under General Halleck, had superseded McClellan, and commanded a division in the defence of Fredericksburg. He took a prominent part also in the battle of Gettysburg, and at Gettysburg he was wounded which disabled him for some time. After a partial recovery he resumed command of his division, and fought upon the Wilderness campaign in 1864, but was compelled by his wounds to withdraw and devote himself to the duties of the war to less active services, however, had continued as one of the able soldiers of the United States army, and from the outbreak of the war till his death he was employed in high military positions. Of these the last and most important was that of the command of the Department of the Potomac, to which he was appointed although an active Democrat by the Republican President, Grant, in 1872. At the presidential election of 1880 he was chosen Vice-President at the Democratic Convention as their opposition to General Garfield, as defeated by 59 votes. He was, through the electoral struggle, respected and regarded even from his opponents. General Hancock took no part in public life beyond that connected with his command. He had his official residence at Governor's Palace, New York Harbour, on the 9th,

at, Randolph. — Randolph was one of the most original and of modern English humorous writers, born, in 1846, at Chester and

educated at Henry VIII.'s School, in that city. He began life as a clerk in a bank, first at Whitchurch and subsequently at Manchester. His earliest attempts at writing attracted little notice beyond the circle of his immediate friends, and even his first published illustrations in "London Society" met with little attention from the public. It was as a book illustrator that he first obtained celebrity, his first great success being a series of illustrations to Washington Irving's "Old Christmas," published in 1875, this work being followed the next year by "Bracebridge Hall." The invention, humour, and admirable drawing of the vignettes and borders with which the volumes were embellished at once attracted notice, and secured for the artist ample and remunerative employment. In 1877 he illustrated the "North Italian Folk" of Mrs. Comyns Carr, and two years later there appeared his illustrations of the "Breton Folk" of Mr. H. Blackburn. It was not, however, until 1878 that he displayed the full extent of his powers in the drawings made for the coloured "Picture Books," the first of the series including "John Gilpin," "The House that Jack Built," and "A Frog he would a Wooing Go," being perhaps the best of his productions. In these works, in addition to the feeling previously displayed for village scenery and architecture, he revealed a talent for animal drawing pervaded in every line with the most exquisite humour. He succeeded as no other artist had previously in giving to the subjects of his pencil the most characteristic qualities of humanity, but it was in his delineation of dogs that he displayed his greatest genius while preserving their own. From this time up to the date of his death, in spite of failing health and waning strength, his pencil was never idle. Besides the series of nursery tales and rhymes with which his name will be ever connected, he contributed frequently both drawings and letterpress to the *Graphic* and other illustrated papers; he published a "Sketch Book" (1883) and a new edition of "Æsop's Fables," besides illustrating a number of works for other authors and producing pictures for exhibition. In 1880 he was elected a member of the Manchester Academy of Arts, and was one of the originally elected members of the Royal Institute of Painters in Water Colours.

In November of 1885 he left England in order to avoid the cold season, but his work had detained him so long that his voyage across the Atlantic was most trying to a constitution already enfeebled. For some weeks he was unable to be removed from New York, and when he could be taken south it was too late. After a slight rally he died on the 12th, at St. Augustine, Florida.

**Principal Tulloch.**—The Very Rev. John Tulloch, D.D., LL.D., senior Principal of St. Andrews University, who died at Torquay on the 13th, was born near Tippermuir, in Perthshire, in 1823, where his father had for many years been minister of the parish. He entered the United College of St. Salvador and St. Leonard, St. Andrews, in 1837, and after completing his literary and philosophical studies there he passed into the College of St. Mary as a student of theology, the college of which he afterwards became Principal. In 1845 he was ordained a minister to a church in Dundee, whence in 1849 he removed to Kittina, Forfarshire. In 1854, at the early age of 31, he succeeded Principal Haldane both as the head of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, and as Professor of Divinity, receiving at the same time the degree of D.D. In the discharge of the duties of the twofold office he spent the remainder of his years, working up to within a few months of his death. His collegiate duties left him a large amount of leisure, which he turned to account with characteristic energy. An eloquent preacher, his services were always welcomed in the chief pulpits of Scotland, but his chief devotion was to literary work, and in this department he obtained a wide popularity. He first attracted attention as a contributor to the *British Quarterly Review* and the *North British Review*, becoming afterwards also a contributor to the *Edinburgh* and the *Contemporary Reviews*. His name was first made familiar to English scholars by his obtaining in 1855 the second Burnett prize for an essay on "The Being and Attributes of God," afterwards published under the title of "Theism." He was the author of many other works, the chief of which are "The Leaders of the Reformation" (1859); "English Puritanism and its Leaders" (1861); and "Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century" (2 vols., 1872). In the public business of his own church he took a prominent part. He was for many years one of the clerks of the General Assembly, and in 1878 he was raised to the Moderator's Chair, his

graceful and genial manners eminently qualifying him to fill such public offices. In his views of Church matters he was large-hearted and liberal, his character in this respect procuring for him the friendship of Dean Stanley and other prominent men in the Church of England. He was a Liberal in politics, but owing to the pressing of the movement for disestablishment he withdrew in 1885 from active participation in political affairs. In addition to his other offices Principal Tulloch was one of the Deans of the Chapel Royal, and Dean of the Order of the Thistle.

**Viscount Cardwell.**—The Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, whose death took place at Torquay on the 15th, was the son of John Cardwell, an eminent Liverpool merchant. He was born July 24, 1818, and educated at Winchester, where in 1832 he gained the Balliol scholarship. He graduated in 1835, taking a double first degree (classics and mathematics), and soon afterwards was elected Fellow of his college. He was called to the Bar in 1838, but shortly afterwards abandoned law for politics, and in 1842 entered Parliament as Conservative member for Clitheroe. In the financial changes of 1845-46 he supported Sir Robert Peel, and in 1845 was appointed Secretary of the Treasury. In 1847 he was elected member for his native town of Liverpool, a position he retained until 1852, but which he lost in the general election of that year. In Jan. 1853 he was returned for the city of Oxford, but four years later was beaten in the contest of March 1857. When, however, one of his opponents was unseated on petition he again offered himself, and was elected in the July of the same year. He continued to represent Oxford from this time until Feb. 1874, when he was elevated by Mr. Gladstone to the peerage. On the formation of the Coalition Ministry under Lord Aberdeen in 1852 Mr. Cardwell became President of the Board of Trade without a seat in the Cabinet, his tenure of office being marked by the introduction of some useful and valuable reforms, while he displayed considerable ability as a speaker on the various questions that arose during his administration. After the fall of the ministry in 1855 Mr. Cardwell remained a private member until 1859, when he accepted office under Lord Palmerston, becoming Chief Secretary for Ireland with a seat in the Cabinet, which post he held until July 1861, when he became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. In March



1864 he succeeded the Duke of Newcastle as Secretary of State for the Colonies, and held the same appointment under Earl Russell's administration until 1866. It was during his administration of the Colonial Department that the riots in Jamaica took place, the severe repression of which by Governor Eyre gave rise to much excitement in England. The measures adopted by Mr. Cardwell for dealing with the subject, though they failed to satisfy the extreme partisans of either side, yet commanded the general approval of the nation, and in the end resulted in the abolition of the Jamaica legislature and the placing of the island as a Crown Colony under Sir J. P. Grant. In Dec. 1868, on the formation of Mr. Gladstone's first Cabinet, Mr. Cardwell became Secretary of State for War, and a member of the Committee of the Council on Education. He remained at the head of the War Office during the trying time covered by the Franco-German War, and after its close he achieved the greatest undertaking of his public career in the introduction and passing through the House of Commons of the famous measure for the reorganisation of the British Army. The chief features of this important statute were the abolition of purchase, the introduction of the short service

system of enlistment, the transference of the control of the auxiliary forces from the lords lieutenant to the Crown, the localisation of regiments, the creation of a system of military centre from which a considerable increase to the numbers of the effective army, the reserves, and the militia was anticipated. The Army Regulation Bill, after passing successfully the most determined opposition in the House of Commons, was made the subject of hostile amendment in the House of Lords, and defeated, but its objects were secured by the use of the Royal Warrant obtained by Mr. Gladstone. When the Liberals quitted office in 1874 Mr. Cardwell was raised to the peerage by the title of Viscount Cardwell, and though his public services were no longer as prominent as formerly he continued to serve his country and party in the House of Lords for several years until prevented by the illness to which, after some years of struggle, he eventually succumbed. Lord Cardwell was one of the literary executors of the will of Sir Robert Peel, and conjointly with Earl Stanhope he edited the *Memoirs of that statesman* (2 vols., 1856). He married in 1838 Miss Annie Parker, youngest daughter of Mr. Charles Stewart Parker, of Fairlie, Ayrshire.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 1st, at South Orwood Hill, aged 79, Admiral the Right Hon. Plantagenet Pierrepont, Viscount Falkland in the peerage of Scotland, and Baron Hunsdon in that of the United Kingdom. The son of the ninth viscount, he succeeded his brother as eleventh viscount Falkland in 1884. He entered the royal navy in 1820, and served in the Burmese War. On the same date, in St. George's Square, London, aged 65, Lord Alton, son of Fraser, third son of the fifteenth baron. He succeeded his uncle, the distinguished general, as seventeenth baron in 1853, having himself early in life served in the army. He was for some time Lieutenant-Colonel of the Aberdeenshire Militia, and a representative peer for Scotland. On the 2nd, aged 65, Hugh Mason, of Groby Hall, for some years M.P. for Ashton-under-Lyne, the son of a manufacturer of Stalybridge. On the same date, at Cannes, aged 30, Prince Leopold, the eldest son of the Duke of Anhalt. On the 3rd, at Corbally House, aged 70, Dr. George Butler, Roman Catholic Bishop of Limerick, a warm supporter of the Parnellite policy. He had passed some years in missionary service in the West Indies. On the 4th, at Paris, aged 47, Comte de St. Vallier, a member of the French Senate, and first Ambassador at Berlin after the Franco-German War. On the same date, at St. Scholastica's Priory, Atherstone, Warwickshire, aged 33, Lady Margaret Matilda Dundas, daughter of the Hon. J. C. Dundas, and sister of the third Earl of Zetland. Also on the same date, at Thorncroft, Leatherhead, aged 81, Dowager Marchioness of Cholmondeley, widow of the third marquis, and daughter of the sixth Duke of Beaufort, K.G. On the 5th, at Booterdown, near Dublin, aged 85, Richard Robert Madden, F.R.C.S., formerly Colonial Secretary of Western Australia. He was the son of a Dublin merchant, and began life in the medical profession. From his connection as a special magistrate with Jamaica, he took great interest in the movement for the abolition of the slave trade in various parts. As Commissioner of Inquiry on the West Coast of Africa, he rendered valuable services to the cause. He was the author of some biographical and other works. On the same date, at Queen's Gardens, London, aged 67, John Bridges Lyball, *Q.C.*, Recorder of Liverpool, and Attorney-General for the County Pal-



tine of Durham. The son of the Rev. James Aspinall, Rector of Althorpe, he was called to the Bar in 1841, and attained a wide reputation as a criminal lawyer. On the 7th, at Rome, aged 85, **Alessandro Torlonia**, Prince of Civitella Casci, &c., the son of G. Torlonio, a banker, who, beginning life as a travelling tinker, became Duke of Bracciano. He soon largely increased his patrimony by profitable transactions, and became the greatest capitalist in Italy. He used his vast wealth in making extensive excavations of ancient sites, and the most remarkable of his public enterprises was the successful draining at an enormous expense of Lake Fucino, thereby recovering for agriculture 16,000 acres of land. For this service he was created, by Victor Emmanuel, Prince of Fucino. On the same date, at Brookheath, near Salisbury, aged 74, **General William Neville Custance**, C.B., Colonel of 11th Hussars, son of the late H. T. Custance, of Weston House, Norfolk. He served with distinction both in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny campaigns. On the 8th, suddenly, at Moscow, aged 62, **Ivan Sergeivich Aksakoff**, editor of the *Russ* newspaper, well known as one of the chief leaders of the Panslavist movement. The son of Serge Timofeivitch Aksakoff, a Russian author of repute, he began his career in the Moscow Senate, passing subsequently into the Ministry of the Interior. He served as a volunteer in the Crimean War, and, returning to Moscow in 1859, began a literary life as editor of the Russian *Besieda*. On the 9th, at Kensington, aged 73, **Edward Thomas**, F.R.S., C.I.E., a distinguished numismatist, whose study of the coins of India has greatly contributed to the knowledge of early Indian history. The son of an eminent surgeon, he went out in the civil service to India, and after his retirement devoted himself to the study of the antiquities and history of that empire. On the 10th, at Leslie House, Fifeshire, aged 53, **Henrietta Anderson Mordaunt Waldegrave Leslie**, Countess of Rothes, daughter of the fourteenth Earl of Rothes. She, on the death of her brother, without issue, in 1859, succeeded to the title, and in 1861 she married Hon. George Waldegrave Leslie, the son of eighth Earl of Waldegrave. On the 11th, aged 54, **Henry Bradshaw**, M.A., Librarian of the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of King's College. Noted for his great knowledge of fourteenth and fifteenth century literature, he possessed a unique knowledge of the characteristics of the printers of the fifteenth century. On the 12th, aged 72, **Jules Janin**, the permanent secretary for the section of Physics and Natural History of the French Academy of Science. He was a writer on scientific subjects, and in his latter years had devoted his chief attention to electro-magnetism and the electric light. On the 12th, aged 76, **Horatio Seymour**, an eminent American statesman, who had been twice Governor of New York State, and, refusing a nomination for the Presidency, devoted himself to agricultural and social study and writing. His sterling integrity and kindly wisdom had earned for him the sobriquet of "the sage of Deerfield." On the 14th, in Carlton Gardens, aged 85, **Right Hon. George Cecil Weld Forester**, second Baron Forester of Willey Park, Shropshire. He entered the army at an early age, and reached the rank of general. He sat in the House of Commons from 1828 to 1874 for Wenlock, and from 1858-59 was Controller of the Queen's Household. On the 15th, in Audley Square, aged 74, **Robert Alexander Shafto Adair**, Baron Waveney, F.R.S. He was the eldest son of the late Sir R. Shafto Adair, whom he succeeded as second baronet, and was raised to the peerage in 1873, the title becoming extinct on his death. For many years he had been the acknowledged head and guide of the Ulster Liberals, and was Lord-Lieutenant of co. Antrim. On the 16th, at Florence, aged 72, **Sir Joseph Arnould**, of White Cross, near Wallingford, son of Joseph Arnould, M.D. For many years he was puisne judge of the Supreme Court of Bombay, where a scholarship in his name was founded at the University by the native community. On the 18th, at Philadelphia, aged 68, **John B. Gough**, who during the course of his career as a temperance orator delivered 9,000 lectures in America and in England. A native of Sandgate, Kent, he was sent to the United States at the age of twelve in the charge of a family emigrating from his village. He was an orator of wonderful power, and he rendered immense service to the cause of temperance in America. On the same date, at Ramsgate, aged 82, **Robert Dundas**, Viscount Melville, Baron Duneira, in the peerage of the United Kingdom. He succeeded his brother as third viscount in 1876, and was Storekeeper General of the Navy. Also on the same date, at Vienna, aged 70, **Joseph Aigners**, a portrait painter of some celebrity, who, as commandant of the insurgent Academy Legion in the revolution of 1848, had been sentenced to death, but was afterwards pardoned. On the 20th, in Brook Street, Grosvenor Square, aged 82, **George William Pierrepont Bentinck**, of Terrington, St. Clement, Norfolk, for many years M.P. for West Norfolk. He was the son of the late Vice-Admiral William Bentinck, and was long

regarded as the most uncompromising supporter of the old Protectionist policy. On the 25th, aged 84, **Miss Charlotte Grant**, daughter of Colonel Grant, R.E., and formerly governess to the Queen of the Belgians. Residing in Hungary during the rebellion of 1848, she was on friendly terms with the most remarkable men of the time and country. On the 28th, aged 66, **Lieutenant-General Thomas Fourness Wilson, C.B.**, late Military Member of the Viceregal Council, and an officer who had greatly distinguished himself during the Indian Mutiny in the defence of Lucknow. On the same date, at Ford Park, Newton Abbot, Devon, aged 64, **General Reynell George Taylor, C.B., C.S.I.**, son of Major-General J. W. Taylor, C.B., of West Oghen, Devon. On entering the Bengal army, he served in the Gwalior, Sutlej, and Punjab campaigns, and was some time in command of the Umritsir division in the Punjab. Also on the same date, at Edinburgh, aged 85, **Charles William Peach**, who in early life had occupied a subordinate position in the coastguard service. When stationed at Cromer his attention was attracted by the remains of extinct mammalia in the neighbouring cliffs, and from this was led to the study of zoology and palæontology. His researches and discoveries added much to the store of knowledge on these subjects. Also on the same date, aged 90, **Conway Richard Dobbs, D.L.**, of Castle Dobbs, co. Antrim. At an early age he entered the royal navy, where he fought under Lord Exmouth at Algiers, but, quitting the navy, he subsequently represented Carrickfergus in Parliament for a short time in 1832, and then retired to private but useful life.

## MARCH.

**Earl of Chichester.**—The Right Hon. Henry Thomas Pelham, Earl of Chichester, and Baron Pelham of Stanmer, Sussex, in the peerage of the United Kingdom, and a baronet, who died on the 15th at his seat, Stanmer Park, Lewes, was the eldest surviving son of Thomas, second earl, by his marriage with Lady Mary Henrietta Osborne, eldest daughter of Francis, fifth Duke of Leeds. He was born April 25, 1804, and was educated at Westminster School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1824 he entered the Royal Horse Guards, becoming a captain (unattached) in 1828, and retiring as major in 1844. He succeeded as third earl on the death of his father in July 1826. In 1847 Lord Chichester was appointed by Parliament one of the Commissioners to report on the equalisation of Bishoprics in point of pecuniary value, and he was afterwards one of the Commissioners of Pentonville Prison. In 1850, on the creation of the Church Estates Committee, he was appointed a member, and he retained the important office of First Church Estates Commission for 28 years, until October 1878, retaining, however, his earlier appointment as Ecclesiastical Commissioner made in 1841. In 1860 Lord Chichester was appointed Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the county of Sussex. A member of the Evangelical School of the Church of England, he took from an early period in life and active part in the *patronage and management of many of*

its leading religious and charitable societies, and he was frequently associated with Lord Shaftesbury at the Annual May Meetings at Exeter Hall. He married in Aug. 1828 Lady Mary Brudenell, fifth daughter of Robert, sixth Earl of Cardigan, by whom he had a family of four sons and three daughters.

**Comtesse de Chambord.**—Marie Thérèse Béatrice Gaëtane, Archduchess of Austria-Este, was the eldest daughter of Francis V., Duke of Modena, and was born July 14, 1817. She was married to Henri de Bourbon, Duc de Bordeaux and Comte de Chambord, at Brück on the Mur, in 1846. She brought her husband a large fortune, and during the early years of their married life took only a passive interest in the schemes directed, first against the Government of Louis Philippe, and afterwards against the Republic. She had, however, but little faith in the political devices of the Legitimists, being inclined by her deeply religious temperament to place her trust only in Heaven and hope for a time when the French nation, having turned penitent, would recall its rightful king to the throne by acclamation. When it became evident that she would never become a mother she abandoned all desire to reign, a life interest in a throne to be afterwards abandoned to the Orleans family, for whom she had the greatest antipathy, being a prize of very small value in her eyes. After the death of the Comte

de Chambord, Aug. 24, 1883, she devoted herself entirely to devotion and works of charity. She died at Görz on the 25th.

**Archbishop Trench.**—Richard Chenevix Trench, D.D., who died in Eaton Square, London, after a lingering illness, on the 28th, was born Sept. 9, 1807. He was the second son of Mr. Richard Trench, brother of the first Lord Ashtown, in the Irish peerage, his mother, a lady of high mental culture, being the granddaughter and heiress of Dr. Richard Chenevix, Bishop of Waterford. He graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1829, and entering holy orders was ordained to a curacy under Hugh James Rose, at Hadleigh, Suffolk. In 1832 he married his cousin, the Hon. Frances Mary Trench, sister of Lord Ashtown, by whom he had a numerous family. He subsequently became incumbent of Curdridge, a chapelry in the parish of Bishop's Waltham, Hants, where he remained until 1841. In 1835 appeared his earliest work, "The Story of Justin Martyr, and other Poems," which was very well received, and was succeeded in 1838 by "Sabbation, Honor Neale, and other Poems," which further increased his reputation as a poet. About this time he first became acquainted with Samuel Wilberforce, and the acquaintanceship soon ripened into intimate friendship. In 1841 Mr. Trench gave up his incumbency at Curdridge and accepted a curacy under Archdeacon Wilberforce at Alverstoke, where he remained until 1845, when he was presented to the rectory of Itchen Stoke, Hants. In 1845 and 1846 he was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge, and subsequently one of the University Select Preachers. When Dr. Wilberforce became Bishop of Oxford he appointed Dr. Trench his examining chaplain, and a short time later Dr. Trench became Theological Professor and Examiner at King's College, London. This appointment he resigned in 1856, when, on the death of Dr. Buckland, he was preferred to the deanery of Westminster. Meantime he had followed up the volumes of poetry previously referred to by numerous works in poetry and prose, by which his fame as an author had become firmly established. In poetry his chief productions had been "Elegiac Poems," "Poems from Eastern Sources," "Geneva, and other Poems," and "Sacred Poems for Mourners"; while his prose works included "Notes on the Parables," "Notes on the Miracles," numerous sermons and lectures, and a small volume, which obtained great popu-

larity, "On the Study of Words." In 1853 he published a volume "On the Lessons in Proverbs"; in 1854, "Synonyms of the New Testament," and "Alma, and other Poems"; and the following year, "English, Past and Present." From 1858 he interested himself in the question of the revision of the New Testament, and when, a few years afterwards, the "Speaker's Commentary" was projected, he was appointed one of the editors. In 1863, on the death of Dr. Whately, Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench was appointed to the vacant see, which, with general approval, he occupied during a long and eventful period. In common with his episcopal brethren, he resisted Mr. Gladstone's scheme for the disestablishment of the Protestant Church in Ireland, but when the measure of the latter became law Archbishop Trench took an active and leading part in its consequent reconstruction. After twenty-one years' tenure of his important office he was forced by ill-health, in November 1884, to resign his important office.

By his numerous works Dr. Trench gained for himself no inconsiderable place in English literature, while he left behind him an enduring reputation for uniform courtesy and gentleness, absolute integrity of purpose, great self-abnegation and benevolence, and deep devotion to the Church of which he was so conspicuous an ornament.

**Sir Henry Taylor.**—Sir Henry Taylor, who died at his residence, The Roost, Bournemouth, on the 27th, was the son of Mr. George Taylor, of Witton Hall, Durham, and was born in the year 1800. He was educated by his father, and, entering the public service as a junior clerk in the Colonial Office in 1824, was made a senior clerk in 1825. His connection with this department he retained for 48 years, during which period he enjoyed the friendship of many of the most distinguished men of his time, and when he retired in 1872 he had served under no fewer than twenty-six Colonial Secretaries. At an early period he devoted his attention to literature, and in 1837 published his first work, a poetic drama, entitled "Isaac Comnenus." This failed to achieve success, but in 1834 he followed it with "Philip van Artwede," the merits of which at once obtained recognition, and which most critics regard as his masterpiece. In 1836 he published a prose work entitled "The Statesman," a collection of thirty-four essays, embodying views

rims of a practical character  
benefit of those aspiring to pub-

Some portions of this work  
de the subject of much hostile  
i, that which the author had  
l to be a sarcastic comment on  
of the ways of the world being  
1 for his sincere recommenda-  
he practices referred to.

842 he again appeared as a  
poet, with "Edwin the Fair,  
orical Drama," and in 1847  
ished "The Eve of the Con-  
nd other Poems," and a prose  
titled "Notes from Life, in six

In 1850 he issued "The

Sicilian Summer," and in 1862 "St.  
Clement's Eve." In 1869 Sir Henry  
Taylor was created a K.C.M.G., in re-  
cognition of his long official services in  
connection with the colonies, and the  
University of Oxford conferred upon  
him the honorary degree of D.C.L. In  
1885 he published his "Autobiogra-  
phy," containing interesting reminis-  
cences of the friends of his long life,  
and offering the materials for the bio-  
graphy of one who occupied a promi-  
nent position in English society and  
letters during the greater part of the  
nineteenth century.

Following deaths also occurred during the month :—On the 1st, aged 62, Sir  
rpur-Crewe, of Calke Abbey, Derbyshire, ninth baronet. On the same date,  
owbank, Melksham, Wilts, aged 72, Admiral Sir Charles Frederick Alex-  
adwell, son of the Right Hon. Sir Lancelot Shadwell, Vice-Chancellor of  
. He entered the royal navy in 1827, took part in the Burmese and  
Wars, and was some time Commander-in-Chief in China, and afterwards  
t of the Royal Naval College at Greenwich. Also on the same date, Prince  
kropiroviah Grushnsky, the last male descendant of the dynasty of Georgia.  
ed a life pension from Alexander II., and the last few years of his life  
oted to literary studies. On the 3rd, at Naples, Captain J. J. Kendall.  
ed the army in 1854, and served in the Crimea and in India. He subse-  
ield a command in the army of the Emperor Maximilian in Mexico, and  
in various offices under the Colonial Office in Sierra Leone and the West  
Settlements. On the 4th, at Christchurch Spa, Gloucester, aged 96,  
James Maurice Shipton, R.N., who, entering the navy in 1803, had  
nder Nelson, Duncan, &c. On the 5th, at Ipswich, aged 55, R. C. Ran-  
the head of the Great Orwell Works, of Ransome, Sims, and Head.  
an active part in the introduction of Fowler's steam plough. On the 6th,  
Carlo, aged 36, Viscount Dupplin, eldest son of the Earl of Kinnoull.  
in 1st Life Guards. On the same date, John Storrar, M.D., ex-Chairman of  
ion of the London University. He was appointed to represent the Uni-  
the General Medical Council on its first formation, and subsequently devoted  
time and attention to its interests. Also on the same date, at Brook Green,  
General Bouverie Goddard, an animal and landscape painter, who com-  
is career by drawing on wood sporting sketches for *Punch* and other illus-  
riodicals. On the 7th, at Brighton, aged 91, Daniel Pryor Hack, a member of  
ety of Friends. So staunch in his principles that when in early life  
r the militia he suffered imprisonment rather than serve or find a sub-  
On the 8th, aged 62, on board the *Minotaur*, Vice-Admiral Charles  
. C.B., in command of the Channel Squadron. He was the son of Admiral  
as Fellowes, and had served in Burmah and in China. On the same date, in  
aged 64, Sir William James Wheelhouse, Q.C., formerly M.P. for Leeds.  
of the late James Wheelhouse, surgeon, of Snaith, Yorkshire, he was  
the Bar of Gray's Inn, and as treasurer received the honour of knight-  
he opening of the Royal Courts of Justice. Also on the same date, at The  
rket Harborough, aged 84, Sir William De Capell-Brooke, younger son of Sir  
De Capell-Brooke, succeeding his brother as third baronet. On the 9th,  
icarage, Kirkby Stephen, aged 66, Rev. Canon Simpson, LL.D., F.S.A.  
ident of the Cumberland and Westmoreland Antiquarian Society, and  
of Quarter Sessions. On the same date, at Didsbury, aged 63, Rev. John  
en, D.D., a well-known Hebrew scholar, a member of the Old Testament  
Company, and for some time professor at the Wesleyan Theological College,  
On the 10th, at Sullington Hall, Derbyshire, aged 71, Charles Robert  
ormerly M.P. for South Derbyshire, and colonel of Yeomanry. He was  
of a family which had been settled in Cambridgeshire since the Conquest,  
eded to the estates on the death of his father, Sir Charles Colville. On  
at Egmont, Bracknell, Berkshire, aged 69, General Sir Trevor Chute,  
lonel of the 22nd Cheshire Regiment. He had served in the Indian



Mutiny and in New Zealand and Australia. On the same date, at Troy House, Monmouth, aged 69, **General Edward Arthur Somerset, C.B.**, Colonel-Commandant of the 1st Battalion King's Royal Rifle Corps, formerly M.P. for West Gloucestershire, and twice Acting-Governor of Gibraltar. He served in the Caffre War of 1852, and in the Crimean campaign, and was the son of the General Lord R. E. H. Somerset, G.C.B. On the 13th, at Winchester Barracks, aged 54, **Colonel Charles Napier Sturt**, formerly M.P. for Dorchester. The son of the late Henry C. Sturt, of Crichel, and the brother of Lord Alington, he was well known in London political, military, sporting, and literary circles. He had served throughout the Crimean campaign. On the 14th, at Glatton Hall, Peterborough, aged 82, **Right Hon. Philip Castell Sherard**, ninth Baron Sherard, of Leitrim, and a magistrate for Huntingdonshire. The son of the Rev. Philip Castell Sherard, of Glatton, he succeeded his kinsman, the eighth baron, who was also sixth and last Earl of Harborough, an extinct title. On the 16th, at Monte Carlo, aged 72, **Jules Hetzel**, a Paris publisher, who under the name of P. J. Stahl was the author of many fanciful and humoristic tales and sketches. On the 18th, at Denmark Hill, aged 63, **Charles Stanford, D.D.**, an eminent Baptist divine, who sustained a high reputation in the Baptist churches as an eloquent preacher and a voluminous writer. On the same date, at Marham Hall, Norfolk, aged 79, **Henry Villebois**, a typical English squire and an accomplished sportsman. On the 19th, at the Rectory, Stoke Newington, aged 73, **Rev. Thomas Jackson, M.A.**, Prebendary of St. Paul's. After holding for some years the post of Principal of the National Society's Training College at Battersea, he was appointed Bishop of Lyttelton, New Zealand, but owing to difficulties arising about his consecration he returned to England, and received the rectory of Stoke Newington. On the 20th, aged 101, **George Stirton**, of Coupar Angus, said to have been the oldest Freemason in Europe. On the same date, at Torquay, aged 37, **Laura Maria Theresa, Viscountess Milton**, a daughter of Lord Charles Beauclerk, and widow of Viscount Milton, eldest son of Earl Fitzwilliam. On the 22nd, at Norfolk House, St. James's Square, aged 65, **Augusta Mary**, the widow of fourteenth Duke of Norfolk, and daughter of first Lord Lyons, G.C.B. On the 25th, at Haverstock Hill, **Thomas Danby**, a well-known painter in water colours, a son of Francis Danby, A.R.A. On the 26th, at Montreal, Sevenoaks, aged 80, **Right Hon. William Pitt Amherst, Earl Amherst**. He succeeded his father, the first earl, who had been Ambassador to China and Governor-General of India. On the same date, at Moy, co. Tyrone, aged 64, **Lieutenant-General Henry Harpur Green, C.B., D.L.**, in command of 68th Regiment. He took a leading part in the New Zealand War of 1864-66. On the 27th, at Bournemouth aged 65, **General Sir Henry Dalrymple White, K.C.B.**, Colonel of the Inniskilling Dragoons, which he commanded throughout the whole of the Crimean campaign. He was the son of Vice-Admiral Sir John White, K.C.B. On the same date, at Wellington, Somerset, aged 52, **Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. James Hay Fraser**, brother of the late Lord Saltoun, and the son of the Hon. William Fraser. Also on the same date, at Hildon, Stockbridge, aged 66, **Sir Augustus Frederick George Douglas Webster**, son of Sir Godfrey Vassall Webster, who succeeded his brother as seventh baronet in 1853. He was early in life in the navy. On the 28th, at Annapolis, U.S.A., aged 61, **Captain James T. Waddell**, who had commanded the celebrated Confederate cruiser *Shenandoah* during the American Civil War. On the 31st, at Huntercombe Manor, Maidenhead, aged 74, **Hon. and Rev. Richard Cavendish Townshend Boyle, M.A.**, Chaplain-in-Ordinary to the Queen. Son of the eighth Earl of Cork and Orrery, K.P. On the same date, at Penrhyn Castle, Bangor, the **Right Hon. Edward Gordon Douglas-Pennant, Baron Penrhyn of Llandegai, Carnarvonshire**, in the peerage of the United Kingdom. Born June 20, 1800, he entered the army as Lieutenant in the Grenadier Guards in 1815, retiring in 1847. In 1841 he was elected to the House of Commons as Conservative member for Carnarvonshire, and retained his seat for that constituency until his elevation to the peerage in 1866.

## APRIL.

**Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P.**—  
Wm. Edward Forster, whose death took place in London on the 5th, was the son of **William Forster**, a prominent member of

the Society of Friends, his mother, **Anna Buxton**, being sister of the first Sir **Thomas Fowell Buxton**. His father distinguished himself as a preacher and



ponent of slavery, and his cause of emancipation to his death by violence of a Tennessee mob. His Edward was educated at school, Tottenham, and on entered business as a clerk at Bradford, becoming partner and joint owner of an iron and alpaca mill at Harfedale. His first public life was a visit to the mining districts of Connemara, with his father, in the winter of 1845 on this occasion he acted as the relief fund collected by him and he afterwards printed his visit, in which he gave a description of the terrible scenes of misery he had witnessed. Published, as a preface to a Clarkson's "Life of William Blake," a description of the character of the charges brought against him. The following year he married Martha, eldest daughter of the famous head-master of this step he excluded himself from the Society of Friends, and to the end of his life a member of the Church of England. Mr. Forster had for a long time taken an active part in local and national affairs, it was not until in 1851 he publicly came forward in support of the advanced Liberal cause at Leeds. He was defeated in a contest by Mr. Beecroft in 1851, but in 1861, at a by-election he was elected without opposition for the town of Bradford, which he continued to represent without interruption until the breaking up of the Conservative Government in 1868. He was elected in his absence for the Redistribution Act. He was elected in his absence for the Redistribution of the borough by a majority, so that his political career at Bradford continued from 1861 to the end of his life. In Parliament he became known as an ardent Liberal, and he took a prominent part in the discussions held at the time as to the relations of England in relation to the American Civil War, his sympathies were in favour of the North. After the death of Lord Palmerston and the reconstruction of the Ministry by Lord Russell becoming Premier and Mr. Gladstone becoming Secretary of the House of Commons. Mr. Forster then offered and accepted the Secretaryship for the Colonies under Lord Russell. This position he held until the downfall of Lord Russell's

Ministry in 1866, and the experience gained during this short term of office gave him a deep interest in all colonial questions, to the discussion of which he afterwards gave up so large a portion of his time. He took an active part in the debates attending the introduction of the Reform Bills of 1866-67; and when Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister for the first time after the general election of 1868 Mr. Forster was made Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, an office which he continued to hold throughout the whole course of Mr. Gladstone's first administration. In 1870 he became also a member of the Cabinet, and between 1870 and 1874 he acquired an immense reputation for administrative and parliamentary capacity. The Education Bill of 1870, one of the most important measures passed in the present generation, was conducted by him through the House of Commons, and is now generally referred to as Mr. Forster's Act. By this measure, however, he offended many of the Nonconformists, who considered its provisions too favourable to the Established Church and the voluntary system, and he encountered much opposition and some downright obstruction in consequence. But his thorough knowledge of the subject, strong will, and native geniality carried him triumphantly through his task, the religious difficulty being ultimately settled by a compromise. His next important task was the Ballot Bill, which was introduced in 1871, and after being once rejected by the House of Lords became law in 1872. Early in 1875 Mr. Gladstone retired from the leadership of the Liberal party, and when the question as to his successor was considered at a private meeting of the chief members of the party the two names submitted to the vote were those of Mr. Forster and Lord Hartington. Mr. Forster, however, declined to be put in nomination, considering himself less likely to unite the party, and at the meeting of the Liberal members of Parliament Lord Hartington was chosen leader. By this act of self-effacement Mr. Forster still further consolidated the esteem and confidence of his friends. In the same year the distinction of fellowship of the Royal Society was conferred upon him, and he was elected a little later by the students of the University of Aberdeen to be their Lord Rector. On the return of Mr. Gladstone to power in 1880 Mr. Forster again entered the Cabinet, but as Chief Secretary for Ireland, with Earl Cowper

Lord-Lieutenant. Mr. Forster's position as adviser on Irish affairs within the Cabinet was more responsible than that of any of his immediate predecessors, and the willingness he displayed in accepting so onerous and thankless a post met with hearty recognition amongst his fellow-countrymen. His first important duty was to introduce the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, which after being carried through the Commons was rejected by the House of Lords. The autumn and winter of 1880-81 were marked by a fierce outburst of Nationalist feeling in Ireland, which the Executive found itself powerless to control, and additional powers were sought, and after a bitter struggle obtained, from Parliament in the beginning of 1881. The Protection Act became law on March 2, and by the end of the month some 30 or 40 men had been arrested "on reasonable suspicion" of complicity in outrage or intimidation. During the next two months the numbers in custody increased rapidly, and in June the Parnellites in the House of Commons commenced a passionately hostile attack upon Mr. Forster, which they prolonged during the remainder of the session with the unconcealed design of destroying his health and exhausting his patience. While at Westminster every device was resorted to to exasperate or intimidate the Irish Secretary, in Ireland everything was done to thwart his policy and render him odious to the nation. It was, moreover, subsequently proved that during the winter of 1881-82 his life was in constant danger from a deadly conspiracy, and he had escaped only by a series of accidents. Meantime the arrests continued, and at one period about a thousand persons, including Mr. Parnell and two other members of Parliament, were detained in prison. At length, however, in the spring of 1882 the Government decided to release Mr. Parnell and his fellow-prisoners, on the understanding that they would use their influence in the suppression of outrages. This new departure was disapproved of both by the Lord-Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, both of whom thereupon tendered their resignations. Lord Frederick Cavendish, who succeeded Mr. Forster, was brutally murdered in Phoenix Park on the day of his arrival, and amidst the consternation which followed this murder Mr. Forster at once offered his services, volunteering to act in the place of the Chief Secretary until a substitute could be found. The offer was not accepted, but it was characteristic of the man. The only

further incident worthy of note in connection with his Irish Administration was his outspoken denunciation of the Parnellites and the Land League soon after the opening of Parliament in 1883, in which he charged them with connivance at the crime and outrage which had disgraced certain districts in Ireland during the three preceding years. His speech upon this occasion exerted an immense influence over the public opinion of the country, and, although it provoked a bitter reply from Mr. Parnell, that gentleman's attempted exoneration of some of those working with arms similar to his own seemed to carry but little conviction. From this time, however, Mr. Forster held himself ostensibly aloof from the party organisation of the Liberals. He was unable to approve of the new policy adopted towards Ireland, and was too independent to conceal his opinion for the sake of office. On the other hand, he welcomed the extension of the county franchise by speaking and voting in favour of the Government measure, but he strongly condemned the policy pursued both in Egypt and South Africa. The South African problem had long been a special object of his study. He had inherited from his father an interest in the welfare of all coloured races, and with this he combined a profound distrust of the Boers, a respect for treaties, and a belief in the governing capacities of Englishmen. These motives therefore induced him to support ardently all measures having for their object to insure British rule over the black tribes. Mr. Forster was also an active worker in the cause of Imperial Federation, presiding at several of the meetings of the Imperial Federation League, and constantly writing and speaking in favour of its object. In the summer of 1885 his health failed, and though a partial recovery took place he never fully regained his strength, and though elected, as we have said, for the central division of Bradford, he never took his seat in the new Parliament. His last utterance in public affairs was given in a letter to the *Daily News*, published Dec. 23, 1885, in which he condemned any form of Irish Parliament as fraught with danger to Great Britain and Ireland. Having no children of their own, Mr. and Mrs. Forster adopted two nephews and two nieces, the children of the latter's deceased brother, William Delafield Arnold, author of "Oakfield" and Director of Public Education in the Punjab. Although by his own desire Mr. Forster was buried amongst his

n kindred in Wharfedale, a funeral service was held in Westminster Abbey previous to the removal of his body to London; and on this occasion those without distinction of party, poli-

tical or religious, thronged the Abbey to pay him this last tribute of respect showed the deep hold which his manly, chivalrous character had taken upon his friends, associates, and the public.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 2nd, at Sutton, Surrey, aged 66, Edward Solly, F.R.S., F.S.A., distinguished as a writer and a lecturer on agricultural chemistry. On the same date, at Torquay, aged 70, Vice-miral A. P. Eardley Wilmot, C.B., who was present during all the operations in Crimea, and, whilst Commodore on the West Coast of Africa, was by his energy and zeal the main cause of the suppression of the slave trade there. On the 3rd, at Bursledon, Hants, aged 79, Rev. Francis Chenevix Trench, formerly rector of Islip, Kent, and brother of the Archbishop of Dublin. On the 4th, at Copenhagen, aged 85, Count Danneskiold Samsøe, of Samsøe, Denmark, Knight-Commander of the Dannebrog, formerly well known in London society. He married a daughter of first Marquess of Ailesbury. On the 6th, aged 81, Rev. Lord Wriothlesley Russell, Canon of Windsor, and Rector of Chenies, Bucks; son of the sixth Duke of Bedford, and Chaplain-in-Ordinary and Deputy Clerk of the Closet to the Queen. On the same date, at Zara, aged 55, Lieutenant Field-marshal Baron Louis Cornaro, Governor of Dalmatia, a distinguished officer of the Austro-Hungarian army, a descendant of the ancient Venetian family of Cornaro. On the 10th, aged 81, John Welsh, formerly United States Minister in England. He had started in life as a merchant in Philadelphia, and was one of the founders of the Protestant Episcopal Hospital in that city. On the 12th, at Copenhagen, aged 78, Edward Collin, the well-known friend of Hans Andersen, and himself an author. He had been at one time Permanent Secretary of the Finance Department. On the 13th, by suicide whilst in a state of unsound mind, Anthony Ashley-Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, Baron Ashley of Wimborne, St. Giles, Dorset, and Baron Cooper of Pawlett, in the peerage of England, and a baronet. He was born June 27, 1831, and succeeded to the title, left vacant by the death of his father, of philanthropic fame, Oct. 1, 1885. He married Aug. 22, 1857, Lady Harriet Augusta Anne Seymourina Chichester, only daughter of third Marquess of Donegall. Lord Shaftesbury had sat in Parliament first as member for Hull (1857–59), and afterwards for Cricklade (1859–65). He took a great interest in the Naval Volunteers. On the 16th, at Edinburgh, aged 73, Right Rev. Dr. Cotterill, Bishop of the Diocese, in connection with the Scottish Episcopal Church. Formerly a chaplain at Madras, he returned to England, and was successively Principal of Brighton College, Bishop of Grahamstown, and Bishop of Edinburgh. On the same date, at Brussels, aged 86, Colonel Horatio Walpole, late of 79th Foot, who was the son of the Hon. Robert Walpole, some time Clerk of the Privy Council, and Minister Plenipotentiary at Lisbon. Also on the same date, in Beckenburgh Square, aged 88, Sampson Low, the son of a famous printer in Soho early in the century. He was the founder of the well-known publishing firm of Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, and of the trade publication known as the *Publishers' Circular*. On the 19th, at Paris, Duc de Castries, well known in sporting circles as the owner of a famous racing stud. He was a staunch Legitimist, and came of a family which once occupied an almost sovereign position in the neighbourhood of Montpellier. On the 20th, on board the *Chusan*, at Aden, aged 32, Hon. Lionel Tennyson, son of the Poet Laureate, from whom he inherited much literary ability. He was a frequent contributor to various periodicals, and compiled a valuable report on India for the India Office, where for some time he held a post in the Political and Secret Department. On the 22nd, in Eaton Place, aged 77, Sir Henry Morgan Vane, who was for thirty years Secretary to the Charity Commission. He was the son of Mr. J. H. Vane, and heir-presumptive to the barony of Barnard, one of the baronies merged in the dukedom of Cleveland. On the 23rd, at Pye Nest, Halifax, aged 73, Lieut.-Col. Sir Henry Edwards, first baronet, sometime M.P. for Halifax (1847–52) and for Beverley (1859–69), Colonel-Commandant of the 2nd West York Yeomanry Cavalry, and Provincial Grandmaster of the West Yorkshire Freemasons. He was the son of Henry Lees Edwards, of Pye Nest, Halifax, and married Maria Churchill, daughter of Thomas Coster, Esq., of Marchwood, Southampton. On the same date, in London, aged 69, Josiah Pittman, a musician, for many years associated with the production of Italian operas in this country. He was organist and choir-master at Lincoln's Inn Chapel, and had considerable literary abilities as a

lecturer and editor. On the 24th, at Ventnor, aged 77, **Right Hon. Charles Crespigny Vivian**, Baron Vivian of Glynn, and of Truro, Cornwall, for which county he was Lord-Lieutenant, and a Special Deputy Warden of Stannaries. He represented Bodmin in Parliament 1837-42, and was the son of the first Baron Vivian, G.C.B., a distinguished soldier, some time Master-General of Ordnance. On the 26th, at Edinburgh, aged 86, **Duncan M'Laren**, formerly M.P. for that city, where he had also filled the various offices of Baillie, Treasurer, and Lord Provost. His education had been humble, and he was a self-made man, beginning life as a draper's assistant. On the same date, at Langres, aged 82, **Eugene Isabey**, a painter of sea pieces and landscapes, a son of the distinguished miniature painter. On the 27th, aged 71, **Thomas Edwards**, the Banff naturalist, a shoemaker by trade. In spite of all obstacles he pursued his researches in natural history, and embodied his discoveries in a series of valuable papers contributed to the scientific magazines. He had for some time acted as Curator of the Banff Museum. On the same date, in Norfolk Square, Hyde Park, aged 63, **Sir William Rose Robinson**, K.C.S.I., a son of William Rose Robinson, of Chermiston, Midlothian. He entered the Madras Civil Service in 1842, and when member of the Council of the Government of Madras served as Acting Governor on the death of Lord Hobart in 1875. Also on the same date, in Manchester, aged 78, **Professor Theodore**, Emeritus Professor of Owens College and the Victoria University. He had a remarkable genius for the study of languages, and was considered to be one of the most accomplished Oriental scholars of his day. On the 28th, at Dawlish, aged 70, **Rev. Richard Dalton Barham**, formerly Rector of Lolworth, near Cambridge, son of the author of the *Ingoldsby Legends*, and the author of a life of his father and of a biography of Theodore Hook.

## MAY.

**Lord Redesdale.**—The Right Hon. John Thomas Freeman Mitford, second Baron Redesdale of Redesdale, in Northumberland, who died May 2, was the son of John Mitford, first baron, by Lady Frances Percival, sixth daughter of John, second Earl of Egmont, and was born in Ireland Sept. 9, 1805. He was educated at Eton and at New College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1825. On the death of his father in 1830 he succeeded to the title, but for five or six years took no part in the debates in the House of Lords. In the session of 1837, however, he began to manifest an interest in practical measures of legislation, and in a short time he acquired considerable authority by his capacity for mastering the details of a complicated measure. During the next fifteen years he was of great service in the transaction of the private business of the House, and when, in 1851, Lord Shaftesbury retired from the office of Chairman of Committees, Lord Redesdale was unanimously appointed to the post. From this date Lord Redesdale exercised enormous influence over the private Bill legislation of the Upper House. Agents and attorneys were kept rigidly in order by the active and astute chairman, and he invariably resisted all attempts to bias his judgment. He had a strong sense of right, an excellent understanding, and his independence

was always unquestioned. One of his duties was to preside at the sittings of the peers when Bills were passing through Committee of the whole House, and from 1851 till the time of his death he was rarely absent from his place at the table. Though generally considered a little imperious in his manner, he was universally acknowledged to be a model Chairman of Committees, an office requiring the exercise of great tact, firmness, and discrimination. He was appointed a member of the Royal Commission on the Law of Divorce, but was unable to sign the report presented to Parliament, having come to the conclusion that divorces *a vinculo matrimonii* were not allowed by the New Testament under any circumstances. He vindicated this view of the subject in a pamphlet published in 1856, and strongly opposed the Divorce Bill during its passage through the Upper House in 1857. At a later period he offered strenuous opposition to the proposals of Mr. Gladstone for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church, and in addition to his efforts in the House of Lords he appealed to the nation by the issue of two pamphlets, entitled "Arguments for Mr. Gladstone's Resolutions considered," and "Lord Macaulay on the Coronation Oath." Lord Redesdale possessed very clear and decided views in relation to theology, and on several

he entered the lists as a champion of Protestantism. In 1849 he published his "Reflections on the Regeneration and its Connection with both Sacraments," and issued a pamphlet relating to the Gorham case, entitled "Objections on the Judgment in the case, and the Way to Unity." He published "Reasonings on disputed Points of Doctrine," and he entered into a controversy with the columns of a daily paper edited by Manning, on the subject of innovation in the celebration of communion; the correspondence afterwards published under the title "The Infallible Church and Communion." His next attack was directed against the practices of a portion of the clergy of the Church of England who had published for private use a manual of confession entitled "The Priest in Absolution." Lord Campbell called the attention of the Lords to this work, citing from it many objectionable passages, and procuring public condemnation of the doctrine taught inculcated by it. The controversy which ensued the Archbishop of Canterbury strongly condemned the doctrines of the book, and also severely stigmatised by his example and the public at large. His further literary productions included were his "Thoughts on Prosody, and Translations of Prosody," issued in 1859, which was followed by "Further Thoughts on Prosody." In 1877, on the death of the Premier, Lord Russell, Lord Redesdale was admitted to the dignity of an earl. He was married, and by his death the family became extinct.

**Justice Pearson.**—Sir John Pearson, one of the Judges of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, died May 13, was the son of a clergyman, the Rev. John Pearson, of Tunbridge Wells, born in 1819. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he received the degree of B.A. Feb. 20, 1841. He entered the legal profession, he was called to the Bar by the Honourable John Lubbock at Lincoln's Inn in 1844. His career was not at first rapid, but he gradually gained the reputation of an able and painstaking lawyer, and a lucrative practice. In 1861 he became a Queen's Counsel, and in the following year he was made Bencher of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's

Inn, becoming the Treasurer of the Society in 1884. In October 1882, on the retirement of Vice-Chancellor Hall, he was selected by Lord Selborne for the vacant judgeship, and he received the honour of knighthood in the November of the same year. Short as was his career upon the Bench, Mr. Justice Pearson made his mark by his industry, his courtesy, and by the vigour and boldness, not to say the occasional originality, of his decisions. Called upon to decide numerous intricate cases in reference to the rules, customs, &c., of commercial life, patent laws, &c., it happened that in many instances his decisions were overruled, but the percentage of successful appeals against his ruling was by no means high when the large amount of business he transacted is considered; and he had fully justified his elevation to the Bench when his useful career was cut short by the illness from which he never recovered.

**Lord Farnborough.**—Sir Thomas Erskine May, who died at Westminster Palace on the 17th, was born in 1815, and was educated at Bedford School under Dr. Brereton. At the age of sixteen he was nominated by Mr. Manners Sutton, then Speaker, to the post of Assistant Librarian of the House of Commons, so that his connection with Parliament commenced in his boyhood. In 1838 he was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple, and in 1844, when he was not thirty years old, he published the first edition of his "Treatise on the Law, Privileges, Proceedings, and Usage of Parliament." This work, the most important of his writings, is known beyond the political world as the textbook of the law by which Parliament governs its proceedings. Since its first publication the framers of constitutions have found in it the groundwork of their various systems; and while colonial legislatures have been modelled on the lines laid down in it, its translation into more than one foreign language has extended its influence beyond the English-speaking race. Mr. Erskine May followed up his first success by several minor works on the despatch of public business, and on the consolidation of the election laws. In 1846 he was appointed Examiner of Petitions for Private Bills, and the following year Taxing-master of the House of Commons. In 1856 he was called to be Clerk Assistant at the Table of the House of Commons, and Clerk of the House in 1871. He received for his services the



Companionship of the Bath in 1860, and became a Knight-Commander in 1866, and continued to discharge the important duties of his office with as much knowledge and energy as of tact and courtesy until he retired through failing health in April 1886. His resignation was received with sincere regret by all parties, and in the House of Commons the Speaker, Mr. Gladstone, Sir M. Hicks-Beach, and Mr. Parnell united in giving expression to this sentiment, bearing testimony to the value of the services rendered by Sir Thomas May, "his stores of learning and his unexampled experience." On May 10 he was created a peer by the title of Baron Farnborough, of Farnborough, in the county of Southampton, but he did not live to enjoy his well-earned honour. In addition to the works mentioned he was the author of "Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III.," of which the first part appeared in 1861, and "Democracy in Europe," which was produced in 1877. He married in 1839 Louisa Joanna, only daughter of Mr. George Laughton, of Fareham, but left no issue.

**Leopold von Ranke.**—Leopold Ranke, who died at his residence at Berlin, May 23, was born at Wiche, in Thuringia, Dec. 21, 1795. He was the eldest of five brothers, three of whom besides himself became professors and men of letters. He studied at Leipzig with the view of qualifying himself as a teacher, and in 1818 became *Ober-lehrer* at the College of Frankfort-on-the-Oder. His special aptitude as a student of history soon became apparent. His first work, a "History of the Roman and Teutonic Nations from 1494 to 1535," published in 1824, was accompanied by a separate treatise, entitled "Criticism on Modern Historians." To a masterly essay on the nature of history he appended a dispassionate examination of the works of the principal modern historians. The talent displayed in these works led to his being appointed in 1825 Extraordinary Professor of History in the University of Berlin, which, under Ranke's impulse, became the centre of historical studies in Germany. In 1827 he was commissioned by the Prussian Government to undertake the task of making researches in the archives of Vienna, Venice, Rome, and Florence, and in the course of his researches he discovered a vast mass of material which had hitherto been unknown to writers on history. In the reports on European affairs made by the ambassadors and pre-

served in the archives of Venice he found an especially valuable mine of information, and the results of his investigations were shown in a series of works published between 1829 and 1834, among which may be mentioned, "The Princes and Peoples of Southern Europe in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," "The Osmanlis and the Spanish Monarchy," and "The History of Servia," the last of which was translated into English in 1847. The last three volumes of the series contained his celebrated "History of the Popes," which, originally published in 1834-37, was introduced to English readers in 1840 by Miss Sarah Austin's translation, and Lord Macaulay's brilliant essay in the *Edinburgh Review*. In 1841 he was appointed Historiographer-Royal to the King of Prussia, Frederick William IV., who admitted the professor to a considerable share of intimacy, and like his nephew, the Crown Prince, at a later date, was proud to reckon himself among Ranke's pupils. It was at the request of the king that he prepared his "Nine Books of Prussian History," which appeared in 1847-48, but which, perhaps on account of their impartiality, have never been popular in Prussia. In 1848 Ranke for the first time took part in public affairs, and was elected as a moderate Liberal to the Frankfort Parliament; but his impartial and critical temper of mind made it difficult for him to co-operate with any party, and he speedily gave up active politics to devote himself with fresh ardour to his studies and lectures. His fame as a teacher of history was now unrivalled, and his lectures gathered crowds of hearers, which included young nobles, officers, ladies, and the *élite* of Berlin society, as well as the students of the University. Turning for a time from the study of German history, he produced some important works on the history of France and England, including his "French History, particularly in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" (1852-61), and "English History, particularly in the Seventeenth Century" (6 vols. 1859-67). Both these are regarded as text-books in the countries to which they relate. From 1871 to 1877 date a number of works relating to episodes or aspects of German history, including amongst others a "Life of Wallenstein," the "Origin of the Seven Years' War," a biography of his patron Frederick William IV., and "Memoirs of Hardenberg, the Imperial Chancellor." Work continued with cheerful courage up to the last. It commenced at the age of eighty-six

the World," of which he volume each year. He had far as the death of Charles was within three volumes of ad proposed for his labours, ere interrupted by his death. ad proposed after the comple- history to write his own reminiscences. His last ed no trace of age or weak- composition, and nowhere r, simple, impressive style gly appear than in the con- me. His life throughout at of a true scholar—tran- s, and unostentatious. For ars he lived at Berlin in a in the Louisen Strasse, in per room of which most of ere composed. Careful and his habits, he enjoyed ex- th, and up to the last was te eight hours a day to his urs. The complete edition s, extending to over forty-

five volumes, was commenced at Leipzig in 1867. In Germany, von Ranke was regarded with unbounded reverence, and such honours as were open to scholars were freely bestowed upon him. In addition to those already mentioned, and the addition of the aristocratic particle before his name, he was made in the year 1865 President of the Historical Commission of Munich, and on the death of Boëkh he was made Chancellor of the select and much-prized Order of Merit. The celebration of his ninetieth birthday in 1885 was made the occasion of an almost national ovation. The Emperor sent him his portrait and an autograph letter, the Crown Prince paid him a personal visit, and Professor Mommsen presented to him a special address from the historical section of the Prussian Academy of Science. Professor von Ranke married an Irish lady, Miss Graves, by whom he had two sons and one daughter.

he month the following deaths also occurred:—On the 1st, in Welbeck ndish Square, aged 57, Sir Luke Samuel Leake, Speaker of the Legis- il of Western Australia, a son of Mr. Luke Leake, of Stoke Newington. aged 59, Paul Cook, President of the French Methodist Conference, Jersey minister who took a prominent part in the introduction of nto France after the peace of 1815. On the 4th, at Trafford Park, Humphrey de Trafford, second baronet, and at one time in the Royal On the same date, at Seaforth Hall, Liverpool, aged 92, James Mus- associated with the alkali trade of Lancashire, and an ardent supporter education in all its branches. On the 5th, at Friern Barnet, aged 73, for many years senior partner in the historic firm of Simpkin & Stationers' Hall. Throughout his life he showed himself indefatig- orts to assist the trade, its charities, and its less prosperous members. in Berlin, Ernest von Stockmar, a son of Baron von Stockmar, and his His own life was devoted to historical and political studies. On the Jersey, United States, aged 69, Dr. Isadore Kalisch, a learned Jewish rand author. Born and educated in the duchy of Posen, his advanced pressed in his writings, and his bold advocacy of freedom and progress o take refuge in the United States, where he became a defender of Jewish ritual used in that country. On the 17th, in Chester Square, rewanion, widow of John Bettsworth Trevanion, of Laerhays Castle, aughter of Sir Francis Burdett and Sophia Coutts, and sister of urdett-Coutts. On the 23rd, at Dewlish, Dorchester, aged 81, al the Right Hon. Sir John Michel, G.C.B., son of General Michel, of Kingston Russell, Dorset. He entered the army in 1823, and served wars, in the Crimean campaign of 1855, the Indian campaign of 1857, ently in China, receiving honours and distinctions for distinguished ill. On the same date, in Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park, aged 75, Temple, son of Christopher Temple, of Hall Place, Surrey, Judge of Court at Ceylon, where he had practised for some years as a deputy- On the 24th, at Simla, General Thomas Elliott Hughes, Royal Artillery, nber of the Viceregal Council, and Director-General of Ordnance in he same date, at the Langham Hotel, aged 74, James Hartley, of iall, Sunderland, son of John Hartley, of Harborne, Staffordshire. ome time M.P. for Sunderland, and the chief proprietor of the large works there. Also on the same date, at Tunbridge Wells, aged 81, George Molyneux, son of second Earl of Sefton, who was at one ry of Legation at Frankfort. Also on the same date, aged 72, George steiner by birth and historian by profession, he settled in Berlin, and

became an active fellow-worker with Leopold von Ranke, succeeding Herr Pertz as editor of the "Monumenta Germanica Historica." In early life he had taken part in the political movements of 1848, was a deputy to the National Assembly at Frankfort, and as a member of the Provisional Government of Rendsburg he was sent to Berlin to defend the interests of the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein. On the 26th, at Anvers-sur-Oise, near Paris, aged 39, Karl Daubigny, an able French artist, the son of a greater artist of the same name. On the same date, at Eeonen, aged 67, Edouard Frère, a celebrated painter of *genre* subjects. He was early in life the pupil of Paul Delaroche, but he subsequently abandoned himself almost entirely to pictures of child-life and Breton home-scenes. On the 28th, at Ootacamund, aged 27, Major Francis Culling Eardley Childers, Royal Artillery, aide-de-camp to Sir H. Macpherson, Commander-in-Chief at Madras, a son of the Right Hon. Hugh Childers, M.P. On the 31st, in Hildrop Crescent, Camden Road, aged 88, Robert Benton Seeley, the founder and for many years chief partner in the publishing firm of Seeley & Co., and well known as a writer on religious and ecclesiastical questions. On the same date, at Kenmure Castle, N.B., aged 89, Hon. Mrs. Bellamy-Gordon, widow of Charles Bellamy, of H.E.I.C.S., and the daughter of Captain Adam Gordon. She resumed the family name of Gordon on succeeding to the estates of her brother, the last Viscount Kenmure, and was raised to the rank of a viscount's daughter by royal warrant.

## JUNE.

**King of Bavaria.**—Ludwig Otto Friedrich Wilhelm von Wittelsbach, King of Bavaria, the eldest son of Maximilian II. of Bavaria, and Marie of Hohenzollern, was born Aug. 25, 1845. The royal house of Bavaria owes its origin to the Counts of Wittelsbach, a princely family in the twelfth century. The dignity of Elector of the Holy Roman Empire was conferred on Duke Maximilian I. of Bavaria in 1623, and the Elector Maximilian Joseph was raised to the rank of King by Napoleon I. in 1805. Prince Louis at an early age displayed great proficiency in musical and artistic pursuits, the taste for which was hereditary in the Bavarian royal family. He succeeded to the throne on the death of his father on March 10, 1864, and when, two years later, the conflict broke out between Prussia and Austria he cast in his lot with the latter Power. His troops were defeated by the Prussians early in the campaign, and he was unable to give material support to his ally. In the arrangements which followed, however, Bavaria was treated with marked clemency, every effort being made by the Prussian statesmen to secure the adhesion of Bavaria, the natural leader of the Southern German States. The result of this policy was thoroughly successful. In the Franco-German war of 1870 Napoleon III. had reckoned on being joined by the South German States, but King Louis, after some hesitation, decided to support the German cause, and placed his army at the disposal of the King of Prussia. His per-

sonal tastes were not military, and he took no active part in the campaign, although he watched the political situation attentively. Whilst the siege of Paris was being pushed forward he addressed a circular to the various German sovereigns and the Free Towns, inviting them to join with him in urging the King of Prussia to accept the Imperial title. Their answer was in every way favourable; and King Louis, acting as their spokesman at Versailles, on the memorable Jan. 18, 1871, persuaded the King of Prussia to assume the title of German Emperor. During the earlier years of his reign Ludwig was regarded as having a tendency towards Ultramontanism, but his opinions underwent many changes, and he was at length regarded as a Liberal, both in politics and religion. In 1871 he came forward as the patron of the "Old Catholic" movement, and it was with his authorisation that the great assembly of the Old Catholics was held at Munich; and probably it was owing to his influence that the movement made its rapid, though short-lived, progress in Germany. Soon after 1871 he began gradually to withdraw himself from public affairs. Leaving the foreign policy of his kingdom to be directed by Prince Bismarck, and its home affairs by his Ministers, he devoted himself to the gratification of his musical and æsthetic tastes, to the exclusion of the necessary duties of his royal position. His enthusiastic pursuit of the pleasures of taste and imagination led him into reckless extravagance and self-indulgence. The

st creditable feature of his lavish and fantastic patronage of music and theatre was his patronage of Richard Wagner, enabling that eminent composer to produce his chief works at Munich on a scale befitting the ideas of both the composer and the king. At a subsequent period King Louis encouraged the building of the great theatre at Bayreuth for Wagner's musical festivals, of which the first took place in 1876. Although Wagner's music became popular in Bavaria, the growing peculiarities of the king scarcely tended to alter public taste. The performances of Wagner's operas took place, primarily at least, for the king's private delectation, and as time wore on he more and more disliked sharing with any one else the pleasure of hearing and seeing the performance. One of his most frequently recurring fancies was to command dramatic and musical performances for himself alone, and on such occasions when the finest opera company in Germany would be procured to perform in an empty theatre, except for the king, sitting in solitary state. This morbid craving for solitude rapidly developed and increased upon him, until he shunned society of every kind. Gradually he became inaccessible to all except a few retainers and servants, and even his Ministers found the greatest difficulty in getting his signature to the most important documents of State. To insure freedom from observation he was accustomed to ride or drive about the country in the depth of night, and in the winter season, when the snow lay deep on the roads round his castles, the peasantry would be startled by the sound of sleigh-bells, and looking out would see a costly and magnificent sleigh, brilliantly lighted, drawn by galloping horses, bearing the silent king, attended only by a few servants. Another of the king's eccentricities was the erection and decoration of the most costly palaces, and this taste was pursued with a reckless disregard of expense. Although the Bavarian list was ample, Louis rapidly involved himself in serious financial straits, calling for the interference of his ministers and his family. The project of deposing him was mooted as early as 1875, but so long as it was possible to allude or conceal his eccentricities there was a strong indisposition on the part of the Wittelsbach family to take overt action against its head. At length, however, he finally refused to take any part in public business, and expended vast sums of money for the construction of his palaces, his

abdication or deposition became inevitable. The Ministers and Council of State waited upon the king's uncle, Prince Luitpold, third son of Louis I., and heir presumptive to the throne, and on June 10, 1886, a proclamation was issued, announcing that Prince Luitpold had assumed the regency of the kingdom, the condition of the king's health no longer permitting him to transact affairs of State. The Government having thus been legally reconstituted, a decree was passed for taking safe custody of his Majesty's person, and a Commission was sent to his palace of Hohenschwangau to place over him proper attendants. The task was one of some difficulty, as it was feared that his personal retainers, as well as the neighbouring peasantry, might be disposed to answer the king's appeal for protection. No such difficulties, however, arose, and Louis was at once removed to the Castle of Berg, on the Wurmsee, or Starnberg Lake, near Munich. Here he was placed under the care of a distinguished physician, Dr. von Gudden, who, perhaps, scarcely realised at first the worst symptoms of his royal patient. On June 15 he accompanied him for a walk on the shores of the lake, and on some pretext, about seven o'clock, the other attendants were sent away. After a long and anxious delay a search was made for the king, and at eleven the same night his body and that of Dr. von Gudden were found in the lake, about fifty paces from the shore, where the water was comparatively shallow, but beyond which it suddenly became very deep. Marks on the bank suggested that a struggle might have taken place on land; but it was held by some that the physician, seeing the king's danger, and anticipating an attempt to commit suicide, had followed him into the water and attempted to bring him back to land. In the struggle which ensued the king, who was a powerful man, might have rid himself of his would-be preserver, and then deliberately committed the suicide on which he was bent, the sense of the indignity put upon him by his Ministers having goaded him to this determination. King Louis was never married, and in accordance with the Bavarian constitution his brother, Prince Otto, though suffering from mental derangement, became his successor, under the regency of Prince Luitpold.

**Maharajah Holkar.** — Maharajah Holkar, whose proper name was Tukeraji Rao, the ruler of the important



**Mahratta State of Indore**, in Central India, died on June 17, aged 54. He had been placed on the throne by the direct intervention of the British Government in 1843, he being then only eleven years of age. In 1852 he was declared of age, and was invested with supreme authority. He had only been entrusted with sovereign rights a few years when his fidelity was tested by the outbreak of the Mutiny. While he refrained from joining the rebels, he was suspected of being in sympathy with them, but on their defeat he conducted himself with such prudence and circumspection for the remainder of his career that it was thought politic to treat him with distinction and apparent confidence. Unlike many other Indian princes, he had but little taste for military affairs, and he devoted himself rather to the task of raising the prosperity of his State and increasing the welfare of his people. If his views were not always the soundest on fiscal matters, his conduct of affairs was marked by energy, and he was assiduous in his attention to business. Under his care Indore increased both in population and wealth. The revenue of the State was doubled, and the people, although somewhat heavily taxed, were contented and prosperous. By his efforts the capabilities of the Malwa Province for the cultivation of opium were fully turned to account, and he managed to acquire by this means a vast personal fortune. Although he expended comparatively little upon his army, he devoted considerable attention to its improvement, and was particularly proud of his steam foundry, and of the home-produced artillery with which he stocked his arsenal at Indore. His police corps of 6,000 men have been described as particularly efficient, while his capital became the residence of several thousand Afghan and Arab traders and adventurers. He was a Knight Grand-Commander of the Star of India, and was present at the Delhi ceremonial when the Queen was proclaimed Empress of India, on which occasion he and his neighbour Scindiah were gazetted Generals in the English army.

**Maharajah Scindiah.**—Baji Rao, as he was called from the abbreviated form of his name, Bhajeerut Rao, but more formally Jyajee Scindiah, the chief representative of the Mahrattas, who died on June 20, was born in the year 1835, and was placed on the throne of Gwalior in 1843, when the victories of Punniar and Maharaipur had curbed

the hostile spirit of the Mahrattas, and enabled the British power to restore order. It was from the first his desire to appear as a soldier and leader of men, leaving in the hands of his able Ministers the conduct of domestic affairs. He made the army his special study, and was never tired of drilling, reviewing, and improving his army, for which he grudged no expenditure. It was on account of the high efficiency his troops displayed that Scindiah's attitude on the outbreak of the Mutiny was watched with intense anxiety. It is possible that his personal feelings were in favour of the mutineers rather than of the British; but, happily, his astute Minister, Dinkur Rao, had formed a just estimate of the strength of the British Empire, and his representations being ably supported by the English representative, Major Charles Macpherson, Scindiah was induced to throw in his lot with us. Having taken this decision, he displayed the utmost sincerity and goodwill, and though Gwalior, from its position, became the focus of numerous intrigues affecting Central India, rendering his position at times both difficult and dangerous, he never swerved from his allegiance. Even when the best of his troops, including his own bodyguard, had gone over to the rebels, and the mass of his subjects were openly hostile to the British Government, he contrived to keep the remainder of his forces quiet, and to assist Sir Hugh Rose with forage and provisions during his siege of the fort of Jhansi. Still later, when the Rani of Jhansi and her general, Tantia Topee, made their celebrated descent upon Gwalior, he marched out to oppose them. In the engagement which ensued he was defeated, and was only saved by the swiftness of his horse, being compelled to seek safety with the British at Agra. The ultimate success of the British arms restored him to his kingdom with additional privileges and unimpaired rights over a territory of great natural resources, with a population of nearly 3,000,000, and a revenue of about half that amount in pounds sterling. In one respect, however, he was hardly treated with the consideration he had a right to expect after his loyal service. After the Mutiny the British forces took possession of the fort of Gwalior, and, although a promise had been given that it should be restored to him when peace was assured, this promise was not fulfilled until the early part of 1866. Another incident in his career occurred in 1874, when a wandering *takir* came



ward claiming to be Nana Sahib, and the real head of the Mahrattas. Scindiah at once arrested the man and communicated with the British authorities. Upon examination it was clearly proved that the man was an impostor, but as the fate of the real Nana had never been ascertained, Lord Northbrook publicly expressed the acknowledgments of the Indian Government to Scindiah for his efforts to capture a criminal so detested as Nana Sahib. In his domestic affairs Scindiah was unfortunate, three of his sons, after being in turn proclaimed heirs, dying in succession, while his adopted son and heir, Ranojee Scindiah, was detected in 1870 in a plot for the murder of his benefactor. The necessity for adopting another heir was averted by the birth of another son in July 1880, who survived him and became his successor. Scindiah was a man of munificent tastes and enlightened views. He was the first among native princes to take an active part in the construction of railways, and as early as 1862 gave practical support to the movement.

**Hobart Pasha.**—Augustus Charles Hobart, whose death took place at Milan on June 19, was the third son of the sixth Earl of Buckinghamshire, and was born April 1, 1822. His mother was the daughter of Serjeant John Williams, and sister of the distinguished judge Sir Edward Vaughan Williams. At the early age of thirteen he entered the Royal Navy as a midshipman, and saw his first active service in connection with the suppression of the slave trade off the coast of Brazil. At that time the traffic was very large, and young Hobart showed great energy and gallantry in capturing vessels carrying slaves while in command of men-of-war's boats, which frequently supplied the only means of reaching the slavers in shallow waters. On his return from this service in 1845 he was rewarded by being appointed to the Queen's yacht, which he served two years. In 1855 he was appointed to H.M.S. *Driver*, with the rank of commander, and was detached to the Baltic on active service.

He was present at the capture of Bomarsund and in the attack on Abo, for which affairs he was specially mentioned in despatches. In 1862 he retired from the service with the rank of post-captain on half-pay, yet in this event the more adventurous portion of his life may be said to have commenced. In the American Civil War he sympathised strongly with the

South, and his sympathies took the practical form of running the blockade. Entrusted with the command of a swift steamer, the *Don*, he repeatedly ran the blockade off the coast of North Carolina, carrying stores into the port of Charleston, often returning with a cargo of cotton. Although he had many hairbreadth escapes, he was never captured by the Federal cruisers, and after the close of the war he published, in 1865, an account of his adventures under the pseudonym of Captain Roberts. Soon after his return to England he offered his services to the Sultan of Turkey, who was then busily engaged in forming an ironclad fleet, and in 1868 he formally entered the Turkish navy, being at once nominated to a high command. At this period the island of Crete was in a state of insurrection, and the islanders were receiving undisguised assistance from Greece. This led to a rupture of diplomatic relations between the two Powers, and war appeared imminent. Captain Hobart was despatched with a powerful fleet to blockade the coasts of Crete, and the efficiency with which he discharged the task caused the Government at Athens to reconsider their position. In the difficulties which afterwards arose in Syria, arising out of the injuries inflicted on the Syrian Christians, Captain Hobart rendered valuable assistance in the negotiations with the Western Powers, for which he was subsequently decorated by the French and Austrian Governments, while the Sultan conferred on him the title of Pasha and the rank of full Admiral. Owing, however, to the remonstrances of the Greek Government his name was removed from the English Navy List, a circumstance which caused him much annoyance, but which he endured until 1874, when at his own request his name was re-inserted among the retired captains. His restoration did not last very long, for on the outbreak of the Russo-Turkish war in 1877 he was appointed to the command of the Turkish fleet in the Black Sea, and was thus compelled to formally withdraw from the British service. At the outbreak of the war he brought the Turkish gunboats safely down the Danube past the Russian batteries, and he afterwards secured the undisturbed command of the Black Sea for the Sultan's Government, while naval officers watched with keen interest his successful defence against the attacks of the Russian torpedo-boats. In 1881 he was appointed by the Sultan Mushir or Marshal, and is said to have been

the first Christian who had held that distinction. His last public act was rendered in 1884, when, in view of what appeared to be an impending war between Great Britain and Russia, he came to England to place his valuable stores of information at the disposal of the former. This visit led to his final reinstatement among the officers of the English navy.

**Sir Charles Trevelyan.**—Sir Charles Edward Trevelyan, K.C.B., who died at his residence in Eaton Square, June 19, was the fourth son of the Venerable George Trevelyan, Archdeacon of Taunton, a member of the ancient Cornish family of Trevelyan, which settled at Nettlecombe Court, near Taunton. He was born in 1807, and, after being educated at the Charterhouse and Haileybury, entered at an early age the service of the East India Company. Here he speedily gave evidence of great abilities, high character, and untiring energy. When only 21 years of age he discovered that a high official in the service had been guilty of receiving bribes from the natives, and in spite of the disparity in age and position he did not hesitate to publicly accuse his superior officer, and the charge having been fully proved, the delinquent was dismissed. Trevelyan's action in this matter received the warm approval of the directors, and he was soon after promoted to the responsible post of Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. In this position he was enabled to exercise a considerable influence in the administration of the Presidency, and he became the leading member of the party among the servants of the Company who were anxious to improve the condition of the natives. He was especially zealous in the cause of education, and it was largely owing to his eagerness and persistence that the Government were led in 1835 to decide in favour of the promulgation of European literature and science among the natives of India. Three years later Trevelyan published an account of the efforts made by the Government of India in the cause of native education, with a modest account of his own labours. Soon afterwards he quitted the service of the Company, and returning to England was appointed in 1840 Assistant-Secretary to the Treasury, an office he retained for several years. During the Irish famine he devoted his characteristic energy to the superintendence of the measures undertaken by the Government for the relief of the sufferers, and his

of his experiences subse-

quently published gave a graphic picture of the sufferings of the peasantry. In recognition of his services during this period he was, in 1848, made a K.C.B. The next great public question to receive his attention was that of Civil Service reform, and it was largely through his efforts and advocacy that the Civil Service in this country was thrown open to public competition. Sir Charles Trevelyan's name is thus inseparably associated with two of the greatest social changes which have been made during the present generation in India and in England. In 1859 he returned to India as Governor of Madras, but was recalled in 1860 in consequence of his having published a protest against the financial measures of Mr. Wilson, the Finance Minister. This was regarded as an act of official insubordination, which in view of the condition of India and the importance of sustaining the authority of the Supreme Government it was impossible to overlook; but Sir Charles Wood, the Secretary of State for India, recorded on behalf of her Majesty's Government "their high appreciation of the services which Sir Charles Trevelyan has rendered during his administration," and their conviction "that no servant of the Crown has more earnestly endeavoured to carry out the great principles of government which were promulgated to the princes and peoples of India in her Majesty's gracious proclamation." In 1862 Sir Charles Trevelyan went again to India, this time as Finance Minister to the Central Government, in succession to Mr. Samuel Laing, who had succeeded Mr. Wilson. In 1865 he resigned this office on account of ill-health, but his tenure of office was marked by important administrative reforms and by extensive measures for the development of the resources of India by means of public works. On his return home he threw himself with his usual enthusiasm into the discussion of the question of army purchase, publishing two pamphlets upon the subject, and it may be noted here that the Parliamentary championship of this question continued in the hands of his son, the Right Hon. G. O. Trevelyan, M.P., until it was taken up and settled by the first administration of Mr. Gladstone. During the remaining years of his life his name became associated with a variety of social questions, such as charities, pauperism, and the like, and in the treatment of these, as well as in his political sympathies, he retained to the last his staunch Liberalism and his native energy of temperament. Sir Charles Trevelyan

twice married, first to a sister of  
Macaulay, who died in 1873, and  
secondly, in 1875, to a daughter of Mr.

Walter Campbell of Islay. He was  
created a baronet in recognition of his  
eminent public services in 1874.

The following deaths also occurred during the month :—On the 1st, in Berkeley  
are, aged 69, **William White Cooper, F.R.C.S.**, surgeon-oculist to the Queen, and  
author of some valuable essays on different subjects connected with his special  
branch of medical study. On the 4th, at Plumstead, Kent, aged 75, **Sir Edward  
George Lambert Perrott**, fifth baronet. Formerly a captain in East Kent Militia,  
raised the 9th Kent (Plumstead) Volunteer Artillery. On the 6th, at Brookside,  
Cambridge, aged 87, **Richard Potter, M.A.**, formerly Fellow of Queen's College,  
Cambridge, Emeritus Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy at Univer-  
sity College, London, and the author of a treatise on optics. On the 8th, aged 30,  
**William Edward Hercules Verner**, of Churchill, county Armagh, third baronet.  
On the same date, aged 74, **Stephen Peare Andrews**, a well-known American  
abolitionist. He had mastered the philology of thirty languages, and published  
books and edited journals in the interests of spelling reform. Devoting him-  
self latterly to philosophical researches, he believed that he had discovered the  
unity of all science and philosophy. This science he called "Universology." On  
the 10th, in Pembridge Villas, Bayswater, aged 61, **Sir George Welsh Kellner,  
K.M.G., C.S.I.**, who, entering the service of the Indian Government in 1841, be-  
came Inspector-General of Accounts in 1866–70; Military Accountant-General,  
1871–77; Financial Commissioner and member of Council in Cyprus, 1878–83;  
and finally was, in 1884, appointed Assistant Paymaster-General in the Court of  
Mint. On the 12th, in Paris, aged 47, **Prince Louis de Bourbon**, Count di  
Carni, half-brother of the ex-King of Naples, and one of those who made a last  
stand at Gaeta for the Neapolitan dynasty. He afterwards served in the Pontifical  
Army. In 1861 he married Mathilda, daughter of Duke Maximilian of Bavaria.  
On the 16th, in London, aged 60, **Sir Alexander Stuart, K.C.M.G.**, the Executive  
Commissioner for New South Wales at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. He was  
the son of Alexander Stuart, of Edinburgh, emigrated to New South Wales, and became  
manager of a bank at Sydney. In 1876 he became Colonial Treasurer, and was Prime  
Minister of the colony in 1883. On the 17th, aged 50, **Edmund Haviland-Burke**,  
formerly M.P. for Christchurch, Hants, and a barrister of Lincoln's Inn. He was  
the son of Thomas William Aston Haviland, of Williamstown, county Louth, and  
Aconsfield, Berks, who had assumed the name of Burke on becoming the sole  
representative of his great-uncle, the celebrated Edmund Burke. On the same  
date, aged 67, **Sir John Nugent Humble**, second baronet, of Cloncoskoran, county  
Waterford. Also on the same date, at Duffield, Derbyshire, aged 69, **Llewellyn  
Jewitt, F.S.A.**, a well-known archæologist, especially in connection with ancient  
Celtic antiquities. Settling in London at an early age, he was employed in illustrating many  
of the leading works of the day, and for a short time had the superintendence of  
the illustrations of *Punch*. He published several books on Plymouth, Worcester,  
and other varieties of English china, and carried on an archæological journal and  
view. He was the son of Arthur Jewitt, a topographical writer of some note at  
the beginning of the century. On the 20th, aged 66, **Hon. Benjamin Moran**, late  
Minister resident of the United States at Lisbon, and for many years a Secretary  
of the Legation in England. He frequently acted as *Chargé d'Affaires* in this country,  
and had done much to keep the relations of the two countries on a friendly  
footing in difficult times. On the 21st, aged 56, **Andrew Cockerell**, one of the best  
known and most popular members of London society. He served several times on  
the Viceregal Staff in Ireland, becoming a member of the Prince of Wales's  
household in 1878. On the 27th, in Edinburgh, aged 77, **Sir William Maxwell** of  
Kardness, third baronet. On the same date, at Midford Castle, Bath, aged 69,  
**Canon Charles Parfitt, D.D.**, Roman Catholic Canon of Clifton, and Prothono-  
tary Apostolic. The son of John Parfitt, of Bruton, Somerset, he inherited Midford  
Castle by bequest from the Conolly family.

## JULY.

**Franz Liszt.**—Franz Liszt, the cele-  
brated musical composer and pianist,  
whose death took place at Bayreuth  
July 31, was born at Raiding, near

Oedenburg, in Hungary, October 22,  
1811. His father was a Magyar, his  
mother a German, the mixture of the  
two races being distinguishable in the

artistic disposition of the son. Adam Liszt, the father, held an appointment on the estates of Prince Esterhazy, and being possessed of a great fondness for music he was delighted to recognise in his son the evidence of musical genius, and undertook his first education in the art. So rapid was the progress of the boy that at the age of nine he was able to play in public at Oedenburg, and soon afterwards at Pressburg, with such success that six Hungarian noblemen on the spur of the moment guaranteed a sufficient sum for the cultivation of his extraordinary talent during six years. This enabled the family to go to Vienna, where young Liszt continued his studies under Salieri, the rival of Mozart, and Czerny, a famous pianist of his time. At Vienna his success was brilliant and instantaneous; among the admirers of the young *virtuosi* being Beethoven, who after one of Liszt's performances mounted to the platform and embraced him before the audience. Liszt's removal to Paris, at that time the musical centre of Europe, was next decided, and the family set out in 1823, giving concerts by the way. The boy's desire to enter the Conservatoire was frustrated by a regulation excluding students of foreign origin, and Cherubini declined to make an exception in his favour, in spite of the urgent recommendations of so powerful a patron as Prince Metternich. Liszt accordingly took private lessons from Reicha and Paër, the operatic composer, meanwhile continuing his triumphs in the concert-rooms and salons of the French metropolis. He also made various concert tours abroad, and visited England for the first time in 1824. Here, as everywhere, his reception was enthusiastic. He was invited to play before George IV. at Windsor, and when, a few days afterwards, the king was present at Liszt's concert at Drury Lane Theatre, he honoured the young performer with an encore. In 1825 his operetta, "Don Sanche," was produced at Paris, and he became known as a composer as well as an instrumentalist. In 1827, by his father's death at Boulogne, Liszt became his own master at the age of sixteen. He decided to settle at Paris, and here his character as an artist and a man developed itself in the familiar intercourse of the leaders of French literature and art, such as Lamennais, Victor Hugo, Georges Sand, Alfred de Musset, Berlioz, and for a short time with the Saint-Simonians. At Paris, also, he began in 1834 his

h the Countess d'Agoult,

well known in the literary world as "Daniel Stern," who for years remained attached to him, and by whom he had three children—a son, who died in infancy; a daughter, who married Emile Ollivier, the French statesman; and a second daughter, who became the wife of Richard Wagner. During the early years of his manhood he passed through the throes and trials of a poetic and reflective temperament, marked by a strong tendency towards religious mysticism, combined with a passionate devotion to his art. He had heard the famous violinist Paganini in 1831, and his ambition was fired by the idea of becoming to the piano what Paganini had become to the violin, an ambition his ability enabled him to accomplish. To follow him on his artistic tours between the years 1839 and 1847 would be only to repeat an unvaried record of triumphs offered to him in every capital of Europe, from Madrid to St. Petersburg. In 1849 he settled at Weimar, where he was appointed to the post of Court chapel-master and conductor of the opera. Here he remained eleven years, gathering round him a group of young and gifted musicians, to whom he communicated his own ideas on musical progress. He also trained a number of distinguished pianists of the first order, amongst whom were Dr. von Bülow, Charles Tausig, &c. The opera at Weimar, under his leadership, became the home of such works as were written regardless of immediate success, and therefore had little chance of a hearing elsewhere. Schumann's "Genoveva," Schubert's "Alfonso and Estrella," Berlioz's "Benvenuto Cellini," and Wagner's "Lohengrin," among other works, first saw the light under Liszt's auspices. In 1859 Liszt threw up his post at Weimar, where a spirit of opposition to his management had grown up, and for the remainder of his life resided at intervals at Rome, Pesth, and Weimar. His time thenceforward was chiefly occupied in producing the compositions on which his permanent fame must mainly rest. In 1865 he took minor orders in the Roman Catholic Church, receiving the tonsure from his friend Mgr. de Hohenlohe in the chapel of the Vatican, and in 1879 a canonry, without cure of souls, was granted him by the Chapter of Albano. During the latter years of his life he enjoyed a pension of 600*l.* a year, which with a nobiliary title had been bestowed upon him by his native country, and in 1875 he was made Director of the Hungarian Academy of Music.



Both as a composer and an executant Liszt has left his mark on the music of our time. But, perhaps, still more important was the personal influence he exercised over the minds of young musicians, urging them to unite their efforts towards a common aim, guiding them in their studies, and instructing them in all that was best in ancient and in modern art. His taste was eminently catholic; Italian and French and German music found in him an admirer and interpreter. He advocated and practically illustrated the beauties of Beethoven's pianoforte music; he shared with Schumann and Mendelssohn the merit of having rescued Schubert's works from undeserved oblivion; and he was as enthusiastic in the cause of Bach as he was for Berlioz, Schumann, and Wagner. His own compositions, which were numerous and of great variety, were marked by an earnestness of purpose and great technical beauty. His transcriptions of songs and orchestral pieces for the pianoforte have been regarded as masterpieces of art. His

orchestral works comprise a Faust symphony, a Dante symphony, and several symphonic poems, of which "Mazeppa" is, perhaps, the best known; but his Hungarian rhapsodies have been the subject of much controversy. Among the religious works which take a prominent place among Liszt's creations the "Graner Messe," the oratorio "Christus," and the sacred cantata "St. Elizabeth" are the most important. As an author Liszt was a vigorous advocate of new musical ideas, generally taking up the pen to interpret and praise the work of others. With that view he wrote "Lohengrin et Tannhäuser de Richard Wagner," and his biographical sketches of Chopin and Robert Franz, the former in French, the latter in German. His last visit to London, a few months before his death, was the occasion of a rapturous ovation, repeated at Paris, Brussels, and elsewhere. The excitement probably hastened his end, for on his return to Bayreuth, to assist at the performance of Wagner's Trilogy, he was taken ill, and never rallied.

The following deaths also occurred during the month:—On the 3rd, in Lowndes Square, aged 80, Edward Carleton Tufnell, for nearly forty years one of her Majesty's inspectors of poor-law and industrial schools. He was one of the earliest supporters of the half-time system of industrial education, and the extensive development of the pupil teacher scheme in national schools was in great measure owing to him. On the 8th, aged 84, Monsignor Guibert, Cardinal Archbishop of Paris. He had been successively a missionary priest, Bishop of Viviers, and Archbishop of Tours and of Paris. On the same date, at Coburg, his Excellency the Freiherr von Pawel Rammingen, father-in-law of Princess Frederica of Hanover. On the 12th, at Brome Hall, Suffolk, aged 65, Sir Edward Clarence Kerrison, of Oakley Park, Suffolk, formerly M.P. for the eastern division of the county. The son of the late General Sir Edward Kerrison, first baronet, whom he succeeded in 1853. By his death the baronetcy became extinct. On the same date, at Folkestone, aged 47, Hon. Edward Romilly, one of the Masters of the Supreme Court of Judicature; son of the first Lord Romilly, he was Clerk of Records and Writs in the Court of Chancery. Also on the same date, at Palermo, aged 57, Henry Adrian Churchill, C.B., son of William Nosworthy Churchill. In 1854 he served as secretary and interpreter to the staff of General Williams, her Majesty's Commissioner with the Turkish army in Asia, and at his death was H.B.M. Consul at Palermo. Also on the same date, at Southport, aged 92, Sir Charles Munro, of Foulis Castle, Evanton, and Ardullie Lodge, Rosshire, ninth baronet. He was the son of George Munro, and succeeded his kinsman, Sir Hugh Munro, in the baronetcy. In early life he had been in the army, and had served in the Peninsular War. On the 13th, aged 80, Rev. Daniel Wilson, for upwards of fifty years Vicar of St. Mary's, Islington. The son of Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, who had also held the living of Islington, he was a Prebendary of St. Paul's, and was a distinguished member of the Evangelical school of the Church of England. On the same date, at Ramsgate, aged 66, Captain Edward Burstal, R.N., secretary to the Conservators of the Thames. Amongst other services, he had been engaged in laying the first submarine telegraph cable from Dover to Calais in 1852. On the 16th, in Eaton Square, aged 84, Isabella, the wife of Right Hon. Spencer Walpole, Q.C., a daughter of Mr. Spencer Perceval, the Premier who was assassinated in the lobby of the House of Commons. On the 17th, at North Berwick, aged 70, David Stephenson, of Edinburgh, F.S.A., son of the celebrated Robert Stephenson, and well known as an engineer. On the 18th, in Edinburgh, aged 87, James Thomson Gibson-Craig, Writer to the Signet. Son of the first Baronet of Riccarton of that name, he was known for his literary and antiquarian tastes. On the 20th, at Wimbledon



Park, aged 57, **Hugh Cowie, Q.C.**, Recorder of Maldon and Saffron Walden, Chancellor of the Dioceses of Durham, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and Rochester, secretary to the Criminal Law Commission he had assisted in the preparation of a Criminal Code. He was the son of Alexander Cowie of Auchterless, Aberdeenshire, and brother of the Bishop of Manchester. On the 21st, at Balcastle, Fife, aged 52, **Sir Robert Anstruther**, fifth baronet, Lord-Lieutenant of Somerset, sometime M.P. for St. Andrews Burghs, and previously an officer in the Guards. On the same date, at Herford, in Westphalia, **Wilhelm Gey**, celebrated as being the last of the celebrated free corps of Jagers, Lützow's Wild Huntsmen, which was raised in the Prussian War of Independence against Napoleon in 1813. On the 25th, at Ausbach, aged 74, **Professor Max Wolfgang Duncke**, who was one of the foremost historical authorities in Germany. He had taken a prominent part in the National Assembly at Frankfort, and displayed the qualities of an able politician. On the 26th, in Hill Street, London, aged 81, **Sir Alexander Matheson** of Ardross Castle, and Ross-shire, and originally a china merchant. He was son of J. Matheson of Ross-shire; was created a baronet in 1882. On the 28th, at St. Leonard, aged 71, **Sir John Anderson, LL.D., F.R.S.** As superintendent of the foundry at Woolwich Arsenal he introduced important reforms, and revolutionized its system of gun-making. He also introduced several new machines. His inventions and adaptations were so highly appreciated by Government that he was employed to draw up the plans for the small-arms factory at Enfield, which was established in accordance with his views and plans. From 1859 until his retirement in 1872 he held the office of inspector of machinery. On the 30th, on board the steamer *Mistletoe*, whilst on a tour of inspection, aged 59, **Maj. William Edmund Moyses Reilley, C.B.** He had served in the Crimean War in South Africa. As a military attaché to the French army in the war of 1870 he had been taken prisoner by the Germans and sent to England. On the 31st, aged 70, **Admiral Sir William King-Hall, K.C.B.** The son of James King-Hall, he entered the navy, served in the Caffre and Russian wars, in China, and was sometime Commander-in-Chief at the Nore.

## AUGUST.

**Rev. William James Early Bennett**, Vicar of Frome-Selwood, who died in his 82nd year, on Aug. 17, at the Vicarage, Frome-Selwood, Somerset, was born Nov. 15, 1804. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated with honours, and where he came under the influence of Newman and Pusey, and the other leaders of the "Tractarian movement." He first came into public notice on his appointment to Portman Chapel, London, where he soon attracted attention by his vigorous denunciations of ostentatious display on the part of those attending church, and about the same time he published some "Lectures on the Errors of Romanism." In 1849 he was appointed permanent curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and collected a sufficient sum to build the church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, which was consecrated in June 1850, the ceremony attracting much attention from the number of High Church bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries who attended in full canonicals. In his new church Mr. Bennett made a new departure in the work of the Tractarian party,

and in addition to the enunciation of its doctrines he exemplified the revival of ritual in the service. His innovation naturally attracted spread attention and aroused opposition, finally involving protracted lawsuit with certain members of his congregation. These matters, moreover, were marked by difficulties which at length reached such a point that it was thought prudent that Bennett should retire. In 1851 he was appointed to the vicarage of Frome-Selwood, in Somerset, where he devoted himself with the most energy to the restoration of the church, and the improvement of the spiritual and temporal life of his parish. He continued to advocate early principles now included under the name of Ritualism, and in 1871-72 his pamphlets on the Tractarian movement led to a charge of heresy being decided first in the Archdeacon's Court, and afterwards by the Committee of the Privy Council. The judgment of the former was in his favour, and the latter dis-

deal made by the Church Association inst it. Mr. Bennett was the author of numerous works of a theological andotional character, and also of many pamphlets and letters on ecclesiastical objects.

Lord Henry Gordon Lennox, who died Aug. 28 at his residence in the neighbourhood of Chichester, was the second son of the fifth Duke of Richmond, and was born in 1821. His mother was Lady Caroline Paget, daughter of the 1st Marquess of Anglesey. He was educated at Westminster School and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took the usual degrees. He held for a short time the post of *précis* writer to Lord Aberdeen, Secretary for Foreign Affairs under Sir Robert Peel's second administration. Lord Henry Lennox sat in the Conservative interest for Chichester from 1846 down to the general election of 1855, when that constituency became merged in the western division of the county. He was a Lord of the Treasury in 1852 under Lord Derby, and again in 1858-59; was Secretary to the Admiralty from July 1866 to Dec. 1868; 1st Commissioner of Works from 1864 (when he was sworn a member of the Privy Council) down to Aug. 1876. In the House of Commons he was at no time a frequent speaker, but he was regarded as an authority on the affairs of the navy, the increase of which he con-

stantly advocated. He married in 1883 Amelia Susannah, widow of John White of Ardaroeh, Dumbartonshire.

Dr. James G. Wakley, who died at his residence, Heathlands Park, Longcross, near Chertsey, Aug. 30, was the youngest son of Thomas Wakley, member of Parliament for Finsbury, coroner for Middlesex, and founder of the *Lancet* newspaper. He became a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of England in 1849, and graduated Doctor of Medicine at King's College, Aberdeen, in 1852. At his father's death he became editor of the *Lancet*, the duties of which position he discharged with great ability for nearly 25 years. In his editorial capacity Dr. Wakley played an important part in all matters affecting medicine, both in its relation to the public and to the profession. He was one of the founders of "Hospital Sunday" Fund in London, and remained throughout one of its warmest and most generous supporters. In private life Dr. Wakley was essentially a country gentleman, fond of field sports, and generous and considerate of the poor of his neighbourhood. During the last three years of his life he was the victim of a terrible and incurable malady, but in spite of the suffering entailed by his disease he persevered in the duties of his position up to within a short period of his death.

On the 1st, in Burmah, killed in action, aged 36, Captain R. F. Atkinson, 2nd Battalion Hampshire Regiment. He had also served in the Afghan war of 1879. On the 3rd, at West Hoathley, aged 74, Dr Archibald Gordon, M.D., C.B., Inspector-General of Hospitals and Honorary Surgeon to the Queen. He had served in India, in the Crimea, and in China. On the 4th, at Greystone, on the Hudson River, aged 72, Samuel Jones Tilden, a well-known leader of the Democratic party in the United States. He was nominated for the Presidency in 1876, and lost that dignity by only one vote, and by many was considered to have been legally elected. On the same date, at Wandsworth Common, aged 69, Robert Jameson, M.D., F.R.C.S., a popular and prolific writer on scientific subjects. He resided for some years in Natal as medical officer and as head of the Education Department, and on his return to England became agent for the colony. He was three years President of the Meteorological Society. On the 6th, in Bayswater, aged 47, Major-General Alfred George Hulse, C.B., of the Royal Wiltshire Regiment. He had formerly been deputy assistant quartermaster-general at Bombay, and had served also in the Soudan campaign. On the same date, at Tomet, in Siberia, where he was living in exile, aged 45, Alexander Krapotkin, the elder brother of Peter Krapotkin, better known as Prince Krapotkin. He was acquainted with the language of every European country, and was the translator into Russian of Herbert Spencer's and other scientific works. Whilst in exile he carried on some astronomical investigations of considerable interest and importance. On the same date, Michel Nicholas, aged 76, a distinguished French *littérateur*, who was for forty-eight years Professor of Philosophy at the Protestant Faculty at Montauban. He was the author of a number of theological works, especially referring to the Reformation period. On the 7th, at Berlin, aged 45, Professor William Scherer, an Austrian by birth, and a noted student of philology and German literature. On the 8th, at Twickenham, 1868, Lieutenant-Colonel Edward Smyth Mercer, 85th Regiment. He served

during the Crimean War with the Turkish contingent, and received from the Sultan the title of Wehid Bey. On the same date, at Nogent-sur-Marne, aged 49, **Maxim Lalaune**, a French etcher of high merit. On the 9th, at Howth, county Dublin, aged 75, **Sir Samuel Ferguson, Q.C., LL.D.**, Deputy-keeper of the Public Record in Ireland, and for some years President of the Royal Irish Academy. On the same date, at Southport, aged 77, **Ven. Archdeacon Edward Birch**, Vicar of Blackburn, and an honorary Canon of Manchester. On the 10th, in Harley Street, aged 78, **Georg Busk, F.R.S.**, an eminent surgeon and naturalist, who was for some years examiner in comparative anatomy and zoology to the University of London. He was Fellow of several learned societies, and translated some important German works on histology. Shortly before his death he had completed an elaborate report on the zoophytes found during the expedition of the *Challenger*. On the 16th, in Delaware County, New York, aged 64, **Edward Z. C. Judson**, a well-known writer under the *nom de guerre* of Ned Buntline. The son of a Philadelphia lawyer; he had led a chequered career, and was reported to carry more wounds in his body than any living American. He was the author of between 300 and 400 novels and sketches, and for many years his income as a story-writer amounted annually to 4,000*l.* On the 17th, aged 35, **Leo Druser**, one of the ablest of Austrian journalists. On the 19th, at Stisted Rectory, Essex, **Rev. Charles Féral Tarver**, the rector. A Canon of Chester, and formerly a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1843, he was for some time private tutor to the Prince of Wales. On the 20th, aged 69, **Ralph Neville-Grenville**, of Butleigh Court, Somerset, formerly M.P. for Windsor and for East and Mid-Somerset. The son of the Hon. and Very Rev. George Neville-Grenville, of Butleigh Court, sometime Dean of Windsor. He had been a junior Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord of the Treasury in 1846. On the 20th, at Southsea, aged 80, **Major-General Sir William Hill, K.C.S.I.**, a son of Daniel Hill, of Antigua. During the India Mutiny he commanded a force to protect the Nizam's dominions. On the 26th, at Inverness, aged 82, **Bishop Eden**, Primus of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and Bishop of Moray, Nairn, and Ross, who had been for over twenty-five years closely identified with the work of the Church in the North, and was the founder of St Andrews Cathedral. On the 28th, aged 84, **Professor Calvin Ellis Stowe**, who was the husband of Mrs. Beecher Stowe, and himself a writer of repute. He was for many years Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary.

## SEPTEMBER.

**Samuel Morley.** — Samuel Morley, who will be remembered by posterity as one of the leading merchant princes and philanthropists of the century, was the youngest son of John Morley, of Hackney, and Sarah, daughter of Richard Poulton, of Maidenhead. He was born in Wells Street, Hackney, in 1809, and after being educated at a private school was early introduced to business life. The house of J. & R. Morley, hosiers and warehousemen, dates from about 1830, when John, the father, and Richard, uncle of Samuel Morley, took a first floor in Wood Street, John conducting the London business, and Richard opening the factory at Fletcher Gate, Nottingham. Seven years afterwards the London house was able to employ about thirty assistants, the business being conducted in a warehouse occupying a part of the site afterwards occupied by the firm. By this time John Morley's two sons, John and Samuel, were in charge of the whole of the London business, the former

managing the commercial part and the latter the counting-house. With the expansion of commerce generally came a rapid development in the trade of the firm, and the sagacity and enterprise of the partners enabled them to take advantage of the more favourable conditions as they affected foreign nations and the rising British colonies, until the house of Morley became one of the greatest and wealthiest in the City of London. Samuel Morley was a merchant by instinct and a Puritan by conviction: he, therefore, treated his aptitude as determining his habit of life. He never felt a keener delight in a gain, or was quicker to perceive a business opportunity, or more thoroughly appreciated the same qualities in others. In 1858 John Morley retired, and from that time until three of his sons were admitted as partners into the business the chief weight of the business rested upon Samuel Morley. He was renowned for his conscientiousness, sincerity, and the confidence inspired

his judgment and integrity led to his being appealed to in numberless matters of difficulty—social, commercial, and political. In his own business house he maintained a strict discipline, and, while he was ready to instruct the teachable and reward the capable, he had no toleration for laxity, and but little patience with incompetence. His political career began in 1865, when he was returned for Nottingham, but he was soon afterwards unseated on petition. No blame attached to him, and he received in the matter the sympathy of political opponents as well as friends, while Mr. Gladstone, speaking in the House of Commons, publicly regretted the loss sustained by the Liberal party through his absence from the House. In 1868 he was elected for the City of Bristol, which he continued to represent until 1885, when he declined the contest on account of his age. In his first session in the House Mr. Morley, a strong opponent of State-maintained religion, naturally voted for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. He supported the Bill for legalising marriage with a deceased wife's sister, and the Bill for the opening the churchyards to Dissenters; but on the education question he contended strongly for religious teaching in schools, and took a different line to that advocated by Mr. Richard and some other prominent Nonconformists. In the session of 1871 Mr. Morley was chosen to second the address. In the course of a subsequent session he supported the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, and in the course of his speech he referred to his own labours in rescue work in the metropolis, stating that his experience had shown him how vast a proportion of the crime and destitution of the great city had its origin in intemperance. Throughout the whole of his parliamentary life he remained attached to his leader and personal friend Mr. Gladstone, but he never for a moment looked for political office, whilst his principles rendered him indifferent to titular honours. He was made a deputy-lieutenant and magistrate for Middlesex and Kent, but he declined more than one offer of a baronetcy, and when at the close of his parliamentary career he was offered a Peerage, under circumstances calculated to commend its acceptance, no one was surprised to learn that he had respectfully declined the offer. As a philanthropist he accepted his rapidly increasing wealth in the character of a trust, and in its use he both raised the scale and enlarged the conception of Christian

almsgiving. In religious matters his preference for the Congregational form of church life was decided and consistent, but he was free from all sectarian bigotry, having many close friends in the Established Church, and aiding generally men of different religious bodies when convinced they were doing good work. Among the innumerable objects of his benefactions the more prominent were the Homerton Theological College, the Home Missionary Society, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Congregational Chapel Building Fund, and the Memorial Hall in Farringdon Street. He further aided in the extinction of chapel debts by subscribing in numbers of cases a proportionate amount to that collected by the congregations, and laid at different times an immense number of foundation stones of religious and charitable structures, which he afterwards assisted by his donations and subscriptions. In his philanthropy, however, he was truly cosmopolitan, and it may fairly be said that no cause, corporate or individual, deserving of support was ever brought to his attention that failed to elicit his help in some shape. Lastly, he was a liberal giver in times of national calamity and distress, and recognised to the utmost the duties of a merchant prince. In private life he was a man of very simple tastes and habits, and for more than twenty years before his death he was a total abstainer. Mr. Morley married in 1841 Rebekah, daughter of Mr. Samuel Hope, banker, of Liverpool, by whom he had a family of five sons and three daughters.

**The Duc Decazes.**—Élie Louis Ama-nieu, Duc de Glücksberg and Decazes, was born in 1819, the descendant of a magisterial family of Libourne, dating from the 16th century. Comte Decazes, his father, came to Paris under the Restoration, and was successively Prefect of Police, Minister of the Interior, and Premier. The king, with whom he was a favourite, created him "Duc et Pair," and as by his marriage with Mlle. de Saint-Aulaire he became connected with the best families of the French nobility, he was able to bequeath to his son an important position in the political and social world of France. Hence, at an age when most young men have scarcely left college, the second Duc Decazes held an important post at the Madrid Embassy under Baron Bresson, and when the latter in the midst of the negotiations for the famous Spanish marriages committed suicide, it was the young Duc Decazes who was



entrusted with the task of bringing them to a conclusion. This he did with extreme skill and success, and his career appeared most promising when it was stopped short by the Revolution of 1848, and he was reduced to the part of a spectator. The Empire at first tried to win him over, but he refused all overtures, and connected himself with the Opposition. Precluded from entering public life, he busied himself with industrial and financial enterprises, and he ever afterwards retained a taste for this class of occupation. In 1871, after the fall of the Empire, he was returned to the National Assembly, and formed with the Duc de Broglie and the Duc d'Audriffret-Pasquier that trio which caused Marshal MacMahon's presidency to be called the "Government of the Dukes." No orator, but gifted with a very sagacious mind, the Duc Decazes was one of the most active and influential members of the Conservative party in the lobbies of Versailles, and he took a very active and decisive part in

the overthrow of M. Thiers. He did not, however, become a member of the Marshal's first Cabinet, but when the scheme for the royalist restoration had miscarried he received the portfolio of the Foreign Office, which from that moment became the real centre of political attention. His tenure of office was marked by considerable friction with Germany, but his patriotism and ability proved fully equal to the responsible duties of the post, which he retained from Nov. 1873 till Nov. 1877, under various Premiers, a tenure of office unparalleled since the time of Guizot. With the fall of the de Broglie Cabinet in 1877 he retired into private life, from which he never again emerged. The Duc was one of the best types of the well-bred French aristocrat, and it is recorded of him that while he sustained the duties of the Foreign Office he used to say that what he liked about it was "that he had to deal with gentlemen, and that its conflicts were conducted with courtesy."

On the 1st, at Cape Town, aged 72, **Sir John Molteno, K.C.M.G.**, for many years Colonial Secretary and Minister in that colony. On the 6th, in Albemarle Street, aged 50, **Major-General James Durham Dundas**, of the 60th Royal Rifles. He served in the Indian Mutiny and in the Oude campaigns, and took part in the Red River Expedition of 1870, receiving for that service the brevet rank of major. On the same date, at Par Station, Cornwall, **Vice-Admiral Joseph Grant Bickford**. He took an active part in the Black Sea campaign of 1855, and was a Knight of the Legion of Honour and of the Medjidie (5th Class). On the 11th, aged 47, **Ludwig Loewe**, one of the foremost men in the Common Council of Berlin, a prominent member of the Liberal party and of the Jewish community. On the 12th, at Cambridge, aged 85, **Rev. Edward Ventris, M.A.**, of Peterhouse College, for 61 years Vicar of Stow-cum-Grey, and a diligent antiquary. On the same date, aged 70, **Sir John Kelk**, of Tedworth House, Hants, sometime M.P. for Harwich. A noted contractor for public works in London, he was created a baronet in 1874. Also on the same date, aged 61, **Rowland Mason Ordish**, an engineer engaged with Messrs. Fox, Henderson, & Co. in working out the details of the Exhibition of 1851, and in its reconstruction at Sydenham. On the 16th, at Virelade, aged 61, **M. de Larayon Latour**, a Life Senator and a prominent royalist. He was a large landowner and a successful agriculturist. During the war of 1870 he commanded the Gironde Mobiles. On the 17th, in the Achnacarry Forest, Inverness-shire, from an accident whilst deer-stalking, aged 25, the **Earl of Dalkeith**, eldest son of the sixth Duke of Buccleuch. On the 18th, at the Shaker encampment at Hordle, aged 60, **Mrs. Girling**, the so-called "Mother" of the singular body of religionists styling themselves the "children of God," but who were commonly known as "Shakers," and who had for many years taken up their residence at New Forest Lodge. On the 18th, at Paignton, aged 61, **John von Sonnentag de Havilland, F.S.A.**, *York Herald*. He had been a general in the Spanish army, was educated at St. Petersburg, and was called to the Bar of the Inner Temple in 1870. On the 20th, at Margate, aged 77, **John Liphot Hatton**, who was the author of numerous operettas, and of the incidental music to some of Shakespeare's plays, but best known as a composer of songs. On the same date, at Karlsrona, aged 58, **Lieutenant Henrik**, of Trolle, a popular novelist of sea-life. He had served in the Swedish navy for nearly twenty years. On the 23rd, at Cranbrook, Kent, aged 88, **Thomas Webster, R.A.**, whose well-known contributions to the annual exhibitions of the Royal Academy ranged over half a century. He resigned his membership in 1876, and was then placed on the list of Honorary Retired Academicians. On the same date, in Sloane Street, aged 65, **Lord Gerald Fitzgerald**, second son of the third Duke of Leinster. He was captain in the Scots Fusilier Guards, and Lieutenant-Colonel of



the Queen's Westminster Volunteers, but was best known for his connection with music. Also on the same date, at Reichenhall, Bavaria, aged 76, General Richard Walter Lacy, late Lieutenant-Colonel of the 56th Regiment, son of Major-General Lacy, R.A. He had been present at the siege and fall of Sebastopol. On the 24th, aged 79, Very Rev. Arthur Ranken, D.D., Dean of Aberdeen and Orkney, the author of a book on the Church of Scotland before the Reformation. On the 25th, at Cressington Park, Liverpool, aged 89, James Kennedy, an eminent mechanical engineer, who rendered important services in connection with the construction of high-pressure locomotive engines, marine engines, and iron shipbuilding. On the 30th, at Berlin, aged 70, Herr von Hulsén, Intendant-General of all the Royal Theatres in Prussia, an office to which he was appointed at the age of 36, when an officer in the Guards. On the same date, at Deal, aged 60, Rear-Admiral Bedford L. T. Pim, of Upper Norwood and of the Inner Temple, for a short time M.P. for Gravesend. Entering the Royal Navy, he rose to the rank of captain, then, changing his vocation, although his name continued to stand in the Navy List, he was called to the Bar in 1873.

## OCTOBER.

**Dr. W. H. Thompson.**—William Hepworth Thompson was born at York on March 27, 1810, and, after education at a private school, he was elected a Scholar of Trinity in 1830. His first University success was the Members' Prize, which he gained in 1831, Alford being Second Prizeman. In 1832 he was fourth in the First Class of the Classical Tripos, before him being Lushington, Shilleto, and Dobson, of whom the second will be remembered by all Cambridge men of middle age as the famous classical coach. In the Mathematical Tripos Thompson's name appears high up among the Senior Optimes. Among the Wranglers in this year were the Bishop of Winchester, Potts, of Euclid renown, and Dean Alford, who also took a First in Classics. The wooden spoon was awarded to Shilleto. Thompson also gained the second Chancellor's Medal, and in 1834 he was elected to a Fellowship, and afterwards became Tutor and Classical Lecturer of his college. In 1853, on the death of Professor Scholefield, he was appointed Regius Professor of Greek. As the endowment of the professorship was small, an Act of Parliament was passed by which a canonry at Ely was attached to it, for which Mr. Thompson, who had been recently ordained, was now eligible. In 1866 Dr. Whewell, the Master of Trinity, met with a fatal accident, and on the advice of Earl Russell Mr. Thompson was appointed by the Crown to succeed him. Dr. Thompson is known to all classical scholars by his editions of the *Phaedrus* and *Georgias*, which he issued in 1871. Moreover, he edited Archer Butler's *Lectures on Ancient Philosophy*, and was the author of papers on Plato and

Isocrates, read before the Cambridge Philosophical Society, and of a commemoration sermon preached in Trinity Chapel. In 1861 he was appointed a member of the Public Schools Commission; and he was a member of the governing bodies of Eton, Westminster, and Cheltenham. Late in life he married the widow of Dean Peacock, whose first husband had been Lowndean Professor of Astronomy in the University, and whose brothers were Canon Selwyn, Margaret Reader in Divinity, Bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand and Lichfield, and Lord Justice Selwyn. He died after a long illness at the Lodge, on Oct. 1.

**Sir Herbert Macpherson, V.C., K.C.B.**—Herbert Taylor Macpherson was the youngest son of Lieutenant-Colonel Duncan Macpherson of Ardersier, Inverness-shire, who had served in the 78th Highlanders. He was born on Feb. 27, 1827, and entered the army in 1845. One of his first regiments was that in which his father had served, the Ross-shire Buffs. Raised to the rank of lieutenant in 1847, he only attained his captaincy at the end of the Persian War in 1857, where he first took part in actual warfare in the expedition to Barazoon, the night attack on and battle of Kooshab, and the bombardment of Mohummerah. The outbreak of the Indian Mutiny followed close upon the return of the Persian expedition, and Macpherson formed one of Havelock's force, hastily assembled and pushed forward for the relief of Cawnpore and Lucknow. He was present in all the battles which were fought with the Oude mutineers and the followers of Nana Sahib. At the battle of Onao he was wounded, but this did not prevent

his taking part in the two encounters at Buseerutunge, Boorbeakechowkee, and Bithoor. He remained with Outram's force in the Alumbagh after what has been termed the reinforcement of the Lucknow garrison, and he served as Brigade-Major during the final attack by Sir Colin Campbell on that city. It was in the earlier passages of this historic siege that Herbert Macpherson gained the much-coveted distinction of the Victoria Cross, which, as the *Gazette* stated, was conferred upon him "for distinguished conduct at Lucknow on Sept. 25, 1857, in setting an example of heroic gallantry to the men of the regiment at the period of the action in which they captured two brass 9-pounders at the point of the bayonet." He was wounded during these encounters on no fewer than three separate occasions, and the last wound was a severe one. After the Mutiny he returned to England, where he married, in 1859, the daughter of Lieutenant-General James Eckford, C.B. His next services in the field were in the Hazara or Black Mountain campaign of 1868, and three years later he took part on the opposite frontier in the Looshai expedition. In 1877 he had a command in the Jowaki expedition, which was the precursor of our last Afghan War, and took a prominent part in the forcing of the Bori Pass, which was the principal incident of that campaign with the Afridis. Throughout all these operations Sir Herbert Macpherson gained the reputation of a brave officer, a competent leader of troops, and a cheery comrade.

The outbreak of the war in Afghanistan towards the end of 1878 provided him with the opportunity of showing equal capacity in operations on a larger scale. He was appointed to the command, with the rank of Major-General, of the 1st Brigade of the 1st Division of the Khyber Column, and was present at the capture of Ali Musjid and the subsequent expeditions into the Lughman and Kama valleys. After the re-opening of the Afghan war in consequence of the Cabul massacre in 1879, Sir Herbert Macpherson received the command of the 1st Brigade, under Sir Frederick Roberts, and was present with his force at the battle of Charasiab, which opened the road to Cabul. It was after the entry into the Afghan capital that his activity became most conspicuous, and none of Roberts's lieutenants, although they were always mentioned together as "Macpherson and Macgregor, Baker and Gough," did so well in every capacity as the soldier

to whom this memoir relates. So long as matters remained quiet in the city of Cabul there was little opportunity of gaining distinction, but when the gathering forces of Mahomed Jan and the Mushk-i-Alim assembled round the English army in its cantonment at Sherpur none showed greater zeal and fortitude than General Macpherson. It was he who covered the retreat of General Massey's broken detachment, and more than covered it by compelling the Afghans in their turn to flee. When the order to retire into Sherpur was heliographed Macpherson had to conduct a long and difficult march from Sher Darwaza to the camp through the lanes of the city. It is not too much to say that the operation would not have been carried out save at great loss but for his skill, assisted, no doubt, by the fact that his route lay through the Kizzilbash or Persian quarter of the city. In the final operations against the broken forces of Mahomed Jan, Sir Herbert Macpherson enjoyed the credit of the second victory of Charasiab. When General Roberts marched south from Cabul to Candahar, for the purpose of defeating Ayooob and retrieving Maiwand, General Macpherson was again one of his brigadiers, and in the battle of Candahar he commanded the first brigade which led the advance, and may be said to have achieved the victory at one charge.

The rewards of his brilliant services in the Afghan campaign included the distinction of K.C.B. (1881), and K.C.S.I. extra (1882); but more especially the command of the Indian contingent sent to Egypt at the time of Arabi's revolt. The rapid advance on Cairo after the battle of Tel-el-Kebir, and the vigorous pursuit of Arabi's defeated army, were among his most dashing exploits. Soon after his return to India, he was appointed to the command of the Indian army, and when serious complications arose in Burmah Sir Herbert Macpherson was at once by general consent designated as the officer most fitted to take the military command. From the moment of his arrival he never underrated the difficulties which stood in the way of a pacification of the newly annexed territory. He saw at once that the dispersal of the Burmese insurgents was but a small fraction of the task entrusted to him; and he set about discharging it with the energy and skill he had shown in his previous undertakings. In spite of the malarious climate, of which he soon felt the attacks, he continued working, and personally superintending

the whole reorganisation. Long after most men would have withdrawn for a while to a healthier climate to recruit his fever-stricken constitution, he toiled on, passing entire days on horseback. At length his doctors forced him to take a sea trip. But it was too late. He had scarcely left Prome on the Irrawaddy when he succumbed on the 21st, worn out by zeal in his country's service.

**Count Beust.**—Friederich von Beust came of an old Brandenburg family, and was born at Dresden in 1809. He entered the Diplomatic Service in 1831, and after filling several high posts, among others that of Minister Resident in London, he was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs for Saxony in 1849. Those were the reactionary days that followed the Revolution of 1848, and Baron Beust's hand made itself heavily felt.

As Prime Minister he continued to be the bugbear of Saxon Liberals, but in 1854, after the accession of King John, his reactionary Conservatism gradually relaxed. He was at heart always a man of Liberal instincts, and he used coercion with reluctance as a temporary expedient. As a staunch Protestant he had never anything in common with the Ultramontane type of Minister.

From the moment when Otto von Bismarck began to play a leading part in Prussia, the antagonism between him and Beust declared itself, and for ten eventful years the struggle between these two great men continued. Beust's idea was to band all the smaller German States together for protection against Austria and Germany. He never grasped the notion of German unity, and in 1866 it rested on the hazard of a battle as to whether his will or Bismarck's would prevail. Bismarck triumphed, but Beust's star did not immediately sink. He had made such a resounding name for himself in Europe that the Emperor of Austria called him to Vienna, and it may fairly be said of him that he then saved the Hapsburg Empire from dissolution. Whether the means he used for this purpose were the best is a point on which Austrians and Hungarians, and even Austrians among themselves, are not agreed. It cannot be denied, however, that his work in liberalising the institutions of Austria was carried out with a firmness, a rapidity, and a skilfulness which could never have been achieved by a native Austrian. The aristocracy and the Catholics in this country never forgave him. Beust's last great scheme was to try and bring

Austria into alliance with France against Prussia in 1870. In this Count Andrassy and the Hungarians caused him to fail. In 1871 he resigned his post of Chancellor, and was sent as Ambassador to London, but his part on the political stage was already played out. With the alliance that ensued between Austria-Hungary and Germany he could feel no sympathy. Bismarck remained to him something more than a political enemy, and in the bitterness of personal antagonism Beust was often blinded to his great opponent's merits and sagacity.

In spite, however, of Prince Bismarck's disapproval and active opposition, Beust in 1878 was appointed Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Paris. But he had barely settled there when Prince Bismarck made his triumphal visit to Vienna, Count Andrassy retired, Baron Haymerle took office, and Austrian policy was, at least at the outset of the new alliance, dictated from Berlin. Count Beust's rôle then disappeared, and not without a certain bitterness did he speak of the subordinate fashion in which he had to deal with the German Ambassador, on whom he made regular calls, without being always received. His chief consolation was in recalling the services he had rendered to his adopted country. He was happy when he had an opportunity of recalling that he had been chosen by the Emperor to carry out the idea of Deak, and to reconcile Austria and Hungary by lightening the weight of the bonds which united them. He continued to preserve for the Emperor of Austria an ardent and even superstitious worship, and it was in going, on Oct. 2, to Vienna to be present at the Emperor's *fête* that he caught the illness to which he rapidly succumbed.

Some years before his death he withdrew almost entirely to his Italian villa, at Altenburg, in view of the Danube and the mountains of Bohemia, and where, after a long and painful illness, he died on Oct. 24, aged 77.

**Lord Monkswell.**—Robert Porrett Collier, first Baron Monkswell, was the son of Mr. John Collier, merchant and shipowner, who had sat for Plymouth from 1832-41, where his son Robert was born in 1817. His earlier education was obtained in the West of England; and when in due course he went to Cambridge, he failed to distinguish himself either in classics or mathematics. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1843, and for the next few years neither at Westmin-

ster nor on his Circuit did his talents attract much attention, although his steady plodding brought him a fair amount of business. In 1841 he successfully contested Launceston, but in 1852 he was returned for Plymouth, for which he sat throughout his Parliamentary career. One of the first speeches which drew to him attention was a motion which he made in 1855 during the Crimean War with reference to trade with Russia. The force and skill with which he maintained his paradoxical thesis that the blockade of the Russian ports injured the Allies much more than the enemy won him high compliments. Even more by his labours in the House of Commons than by his success at the Bar he earned the right to his legal honours, which were inaugurated by his appointment in 1859 as Judge-Advocate of the Fleet and Counsel to the Admiralty. To all but those who knew him intimately his appointment as Solicitor-General in Oct. 1863 was a surprise; it was not generally known that his professional business justified his selection for that office. Almost equally great was the surprise when, in Dec. 1868, he was appointed Attorney-General. But the choice was fully justified by the admirable manner in which, during three years of arduous work, he filled that post. He secured, in a rarely equalled degree, the confidence and esteem of the House of Commons, and left there a reputation which few law officers have acquired.

In Nov. 1871 he was appointed, under memorable circumstances, a paid member of the Privy Council. By the Privy Council Act of that year four paid members—two Indian Judges and two Judges of the Superior Courts at Westminster—were to be appointed. By accident, or by design, as some contended, the law officers were not eligible to the newly created offices, for which perhaps Parliament intended that judicial experience should be indispensable qualifications. Of the two positions open to English judges, Sir Montague Smith received one. In flagrant violation of the spirit of the enactment, Sir Robert Collier was appointed to the other; and to comply colourably with the letter of the statute, he was made a Judge of the Common Pleas, in which he sat, a curious spectacle and no doubt a reluctant actor in the comedy, for two days, and was then translated to the Privy Council. This mockery aroused indignation such as has been evoked by no other appointment in modern times—indignation, it may be added,

shared by those who most respected him. His friend Sir Alexander Cockburn protested, with characteristic vehemence, against what he stigmatised as a violation of "the dignity of the judicial bench." Chief Justice Bovill declared his adherence to the protest of the Lord Chief Justice of England; and, in Parliament, Lord Westbury, Lord Cairns, and other eminent judges denounced what the first-named peer designated as "a fraud and misuse of the statute," "a fraudulent exercise of power," and "a fraud on the Act." An overwhelming weight of legal authority confirmed the first impression that the appointment was a perversion of the statute. But in the whole course of this bitter and heated controversy no one cast a doubt on Sir Robert Collier's fitness for the office. On all hands it was admitted that he was well qualified for it, and those who were foremost in denouncing Mr. Gladstone's and Lord Hatherly's share in the transaction acknowledged ungrudgingly his talents, his experience, and his success in every public office which he had filled. On all hands there was commiseration at the fact that he should have been forced to go through the pantomime of sitting for two days in the robes of his predecessor—robes which, it was noted, were too short for him. Nor did he disappoint those who predicted that he would prove an excellent Judge. The public takes little note or notice of what is done in the quiet region of the Judicial Committee, and Lord Monkswell's labours came little before the world. But he added greatly to the strength of that tribunal; and some of his judgments are admirable expositions of legal principles, and all of them are expressed with a clearness far from common on the Bench. In his early days, at the Bar, he found time to write several law books, none of which added much to his reputation or became durable additions to legal literature. Yielding to a temptation which more than one lawyer has found too strong, he published, in 1875, a translation of Demosthenes's Oration on the Crown. He was, too, a painter, and no mean one. His pictures of Alpine scenery in the Academy Exhibitions show that he had considerable artistic skill. On the break-up of Mr. Gladstone's administration in 1885, he was offered a peerage, which he did not long enjoy. He had gone to the South of France for the winter, and died at Grasse, near Cannes, on Oct. 27.



During the month the following deaths also occurred :—On the 2nd, at Ramsgate, aged 60, **James Young Gibson**, the translator of Cervantes into English verse. The son of a corn merchant of Edinburgh, he was educated for the Scottish ministry, but, induced by ill-health to travel, he devoted himself to the study of Spanish and German literature. On the 3rd, at Cluny Castle, Kingussie, **Colonel Duncan Macpherson, C.B.**, the chief of the Highland clan of Cluny Macpherson. He was formerly in the 42nd Highlanders (Black Watch), and fought at the relief of Lucknow, in Ashantee, and at Tel-el-Kebir. On the same date, aged 56, **Rev. Thomas Croskery, D.D.**, Professor of Systematic Theology in Magee College, Londonderry; for many years resident in America. On the 4th, at Bradwall Hall, Cheshire, aged 58, **George William Latham**. He contested on three occasions the mid division of Cheshire, and for a short time represented (1885) the Crewe division. He married in 1856 Elizabeth Sarah, daughter of Rev. H. Luttmann Johnson, of Binderton House, Sussex. On the 5th, at Frascati, **Prince Marc Antonio Borghese**. On the same date, in London, aged 82, **Colonel William Denny**, late of 71st Highland Light Infantry. He had served in the Canadian revolt of 1838–39, and, later, in the Crimean campaign. On the 7th, aged 86, **Rev. William Barnes, B.D.**, the well-known Dorsetshire poet. He was originally a schoolmaster at Dorchester, and, taking orders, was afterwards instituted to the rectory of Winterbourne Came. He was first known in literature by his poems in the Dorset dialect. These were followed by many grammatical and philosophical works of value. On the 8th, at St. Petersburg, aged 44, **Hon. George Grosvenor**, Secretary to the British Embassy. The second son of Lord Ebury, he entered the diplomatic service in 1861, and served at many different Courts. Whilst in China he performed a remarkable journey from Peking to the frontiers of Burmah, in connection with the events following on the murder of Major Margary. He married in 1877 Sophia, only daughter of S. Wells Williams, United States minister in China. On the 9th, at Passy, aged 85, **General Flichy**, celebrated for his vigorous defence of Strasbourg in 1870, for which he was raised to the rank of a popular hero, but lived long enough to be quite forgotten and to die almost unnoticed. On the 13th, in London, aged 86, **Richard Hervé Fraud**, of Furnival's Inn, solicitor. Of a French Huguenot family, the principal energies of his life were devoted to the welfare of the descendants of those French Protestants who fled to this country after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He commenced his life in the Royal Navy. On the 16th, at Frankfort-on-the-Main, aged 66, **Baron Mayer Carl von Rothschild**, the chief of the great banking-house of the name, in that city, and a grandson of the founder of the European house of Rothschild. When Frankfort was incorporated in Prussia the great banker was given by the King a seat in his Herrenhaus or Upper Chamber, which was the first instance of the admission of a Jew into that feudal and exclusive assembly. On the same date, at Passy, aged 70, **Hon. and Rev. George Talbot**. The son of third Lord Talbot de Malahide, he had held the living of Evercreech, Somerset, until his conversion to the Church of Rome. He was for 19 years cup-bearer to Pope Pius IX. On the 18th, at Savernake House, Marlborough, aged 75, third **Marquess of Ailesbury**. He was Lord-Lieutenant of Berkshire, and had been a Lord of the Bedchamber to King William IV., and twice Vice-Chamberlain to Queen Victoria. On the 21st, aged 53, **Frederick Guthrie, LL.D.**, Professor of Physics at the Normal School of science, and at the Royal School of Mines; author of a large number of scientific memoirs, and of an excellent text-book on electricity and magnetism. On the 2nd, in London, aged 63, **Very Rev. John Maunsell Massy-Beresford**, of Macbiehill, Peebles-shire, and of St. Hubert's, county Fermanagh, formerly Dean of Kilmore. A son of the Hon. John Massy, of Barna, county Limerick, and of Ship Llanor, county Tipperary. He assumed the additional name of Beresford by Royal licence. On the same date, in Onslow Square, aged 87, **Captain the Hon. Francis Laude, R.N.**, son of first Viscount Hawarden, for many years identified with a large number of philanthropic and religious institutions. On the same date, at Bellinzona, aged 67, **Eugène Lachat**, titular Archbishop of Damietta, and Administrator Apostolic of Ticino; for some years a refugee at Lucerne, the Swiss authorities having resented his appointment as Bishop of Basle, in 1863, by Pius IX., as a violation of the Concordat. On the 24th, at Bath, aged 63, **Sir Robert Jefferd**, of Normandy Park, Lincolnshire, fifth baronet. On the same date, **J. Savington Atkinson**, an accomplished, careful, and able writer upon art. On the 25th, in London, aged 92, **General Sir Abraham Josias Cloëté, K.C.B., K.H.**, Colonel of the Princess of Wales' Own (Yorkshire) Regiment, whose first services were in the Mahratta War of 1817–19. He was chief of the staff during the operations in



the Basuto country, in the Kaffir War of 1851-53, commanding a division in the battle of Berea. On the same date, at Liezen, in Tyrol, aged 64, **Charles Pishinger**, a celebrated Austrian painter of animals. On the 29th, at Church House, Windsor, aged 78, **Rev. Stephen Hawtrey, M.A.**, for thirty-six years senior mathematical tutor at Eton College. He was the founder and warden of St. Mark's School, Windsor. On the same date, at Wrotham Park, Barnet, aged 80, **George Stevens Byng**, second Earl of Strafford, P.C., F.R.S., successively M.P. for Milbourne Port, 1831; Poole, 1835-37; and Chatham, 1834-52. He long held a post in the Queen's Household, and had been Secretary to the Board of Control. He succeeded his father, Field-Marshal the first Earl of Strafford, as second Earl in 1860, having been previously summoned to the House of Peers in his father's Barony of Strafford. On the same date, at Tynemouth, aged 62, **Rev. Dr. Bewick**, Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese of Hexham and Newcastle. Also on the same date, at Cheltenham, aged 80, **Admiral Robert Kerr**. The son of the late Captain G. R. Kerr, C.B., he entered the Royal Navy in 1819, retiring in 1878. Also on the same date, at the Waldrons, Croydon, aged 84, **George William Johnson**, a writer upon horticulture and chemistry. The well-known "Journal of Horticulture" was commenced by him, under the title of "The Cottage Gardener." He was a member of the Bar, and had been a newspaper editor in Calcutta. On the 30th, at Barnes, aged 63, **Lieutenant-General William Arden Crommelin, C.B.**, formerly of the Bengal Engineers. As chief engineer with General Havelock's forces, he served in the actions leading to the relief of Lucknow, and in its defence. He was subsequently appointed Inspector-General of Military Works. On the same date, aged 61, **James Gibbs, C.S.I., C.I.E.**, a member of the Inner Temple, who had held several important offices in India, and was senior member of the Supreme Government of India under the last three Viceroys. On the 31st, at Hampton Court Palace, aged 77, **Hon. William Towry Law**. The son of the first Lord Ellenborough, he began life in the army, subsequently taking Holy Orders. He held different Somersetshire livings successively, and was for twelve years Chancellor and Prebendary of the diocese of Bath and Wells, resigning all his preferments in 1851, when he joined the Church of Rome.

## NOVEMBER.

**Paul Bert**, who was born Oct. 17, 1833, was the son of an attorney at Auxerre, the descendant of a peasant family. The attorney brought up his son in a hatred of priests, nobles, and Orleanists, and in admiration for Napoleon; but the *coup d'état* of 1851 effaced this last sentiment, and when, at nineteen, Paul entered Sainte Barbe College at Paris, his Republican views were already formed. His first idea on coming up to Paris from the Auxerre school, where he had carried off prizes without any exertion, was to be a civil or military engineer, and he entered the Ecole Polytechnique; but he suddenly changed his mind, studied law, and gained a diploma, but, as he said himself, he criticised laws instead of learning them, and was interested only in Roman and comparative law. He devoted himself, however, not to politics, but to medicine, and in 1863 obtained his grade of doctor in that faculty, and three years later was received doctor in natural science. In 1867 he was named Professor of the Science Faculty at the University of Bordeaux, whence he was transferred in

1869 to Paris as Professor of Physiology. **Pierre Gratiolet**, head of the Anatomical Laboratory at the Jardin des Plantes, was the man who won him over to physiology, and he was for five or six years Claude Bernard's assistant, afterwards acting as his deputy at the Sorbonne. In 1878, on his chief's death, he was elected president of the Biological Society, but failed in succeeding to his seat at the Académie des Sciences.

Paul Bert's first connection with politics dated from 1870, when, on the eve of the Franco-Prussian war, he offered himself as candidate for the Yonne Departmental Council, on which occasion he was defeated by the official candidate. On the downfall of the Empire he was appointed Secretary to the Prefecture of his own Department (Yonne), and for a few months was préfet of the Department of Le Nord, but retired on Gambetta's withdrawal from the ministry. In 1874 he was elected deputy for his native place, and held his seat in the numerous electoral contests which subsequently took place. In the Chamber he took special interest

connected with public education, distinguishing himself chiefly by ultimately carrying a Bill compulsory employment of Laymen in National Schools. In Mr. Arthur's short-lived Ministry he rose to the office of Minister of Public Instruction, to the great scandal and disgrace of the Clerical and Monarchical classes; but his tenure of office was valuable chiefly for the useful educational reforms he managed to introduce.

In January 1886 he was appointed Resident-General in Annam, and reached Hanoi at the end of April. In spite of the frictions between the civil and military authorities, he managed in the course of his administration to bring French rule before the natives in a more active light than it had ever before appeared to them. He respected native customs, consulted their wishes, repressed European tyranny, and promoted the progress of the country. In advancing the interests of his country he forgot his own, but by work and anxiety, he fell a victim to the climate of the country, and was obliged to return to his native land, using to obey the summons of duty and a more healthy spot in the world to recruit his health. He died on Nov. 11, having just completed his fifty-third year.

John Arthur, 21st President of the United States, who died at New York, was a native of Vermont, born at Fairfield, Franklin County, that State, on Oct. 5, 1830. His father was the Rev. William Arthur, of the North of Ireland, educated at a very early age at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, and forthwith went to America, being then only 18 years of age. Mr. Arthur became a minister, and held charges in Vermont, and elsewhere. He was prominent in literature, and published several years the *Antiquarian*, being the author of a work on "The Antiquities of the State," which showed great and considerable erudition. He died in Newtonville, New York, on October 18, 1875.

His son, the late ex-President, lived in a log-cabin which his father had been waiting for the erection of a more commodious dwelling. He was not the only President with whom the name was honourably associated. His father sent him first to an academy at Schenectady, and subsequently to Union College. At the latter institution he supported himself by teaching, and after graduating in

1848 he still continued to teach while studying law. By his habits of strict economy young Arthur was enabled to save the sum of 500 dollars, whereupon he left Lansingburg, where he was staying, for New York city. Here he entered the office of Mr. E. D. Culver. Admitted to the Bar in 1853, he became junior member of the firm of Culver, Parker, and Arthur. It was as the champion of the legal rights of the coloured slave that Mr. Arthur first distinguished himself. His firm was employed in the celebrated Lemmon case, in which it was decided that a slave brought voluntarily by his master into New York became free. The Virginia Legislature directed an appeal to be taken to the higher Courts, but the decision was sustained by the Supreme Court of New York and by the Court of Appeals, although Charles O'Connor argued the case with conspicuous ability on behalf of the Attorney-General of Virginia. Some time later Mr. Arthur conducted the case of the coloured girl Lizzie Jennings, when he succeeded in establishing the equal rights of coloured persons to travel in public vehicles.

Politically, Mr. Arthur was at first a Whig of the Henry Clay type. He was a delegate to the Saratoga Convention which founded the Republican party of New York; and Mr. Arthur became an active member of this more advanced party. He had also experience of a military kind, being appointed before the Civil War Judge-Advocate of the Second Brigade of the State Militia. In 1860 he was appointed by Mr. Edwin D. Morgan, Governor of New York, Engineer-in-Chief on his Staff, and he was afterwards made Inspector-General and then Quartermaster-General of the military forces of that State. He held this office until the close of 1863; and "he conducted the duties of this office, in equipping, supplying, and forwarding the immense number of troops furnished by this State, with such success that his accounts were audited and allowed at Washington without deduction, while those of some of the States were reduced by millions of dollars." Although Mr. Arthur had the giving of most valuable contracts and was beset on every hand, he resolutely set his face against bribery, and whenever presents were offered or sent he promptly rejected and returned them. When President Lincoln called for more troops in 1862 Mr. Arthur became Quartermaster and raised an efficient quota of men in New York State. At the close of 1863,

when Mr. Horatio Seymour became Governor of New York, Mr. Arthur returned to the practice of law. He continued his activity in public affairs, however, and played a prominent part in the nomination and election of President Grant in 1868. Appointed Collector of the port of New York in 1871, his first term expired in 1875, when he was renominated.

In 1877 President Hayes issued an order forbidding persons in the civil service of the Government from taking an active part in political affairs. Mr. Arthur, as chairman of the Republican Central Committee of New York, and Mr. A. B. Cornell, chairman of the State Central Committee, declined to comply with the President's order by resigning their party positions, and were accordingly removed from their offices by Senator Sherman. After two investigations of Mr. Arthur's administration, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury acknowledged the purity of his official acts. Mr. Arthur had signalised his tenure of the office of Collector of Customs by carrying into effect great and salutary reforms in the conduct of business, though the removals of *employés* from office had been fewer than they were under his predecessors. In 1880 Mr. Arthur zealously supported the claims of General Grant to the Republican nomination for the Presidency at the Chicago Convention. The Grant movement was defeated, and General Garfield was chosen, whereupon Mr. Arthur was nominated for the Vice-Presidency by acclamation, this step being considered necessary in order to secure the Grant Republicans and the vote of New York. In March 1881 Mr. Arthur took his place as presiding officer of the Senate, filling the office "with dignity and general acceptance." A struggle speedily took place between the President and Senator Conkling in regard to the former's appointment to office, and this culminated in the resignation of both the Senators from New York. Mr. Arthur then actively sustained Mr. Conkling in his efforts for re-election.

President Garfield was struck down by the assassin Guiteau on July 2, 1881, but the shot did not prove fatal for many weeks, and, while the President lingered on between life and death until Sept. 19, the Vice-President refrained from all part in public affairs and the controversies of the time, only expressing on fitting occasions his own sincere share in the common grief and anxiety. The death of Mr. Garfield being an-

nounced, on Sept. 20, Mr. Arthur, as his successor, privately took the oath at New York, and proceeded to Washington, where his public inauguration was celebrated on the 22nd. In his first Presidential address, Mr. Arthur engaged to carry out the policy of his predecessor, and when the members of Mr. Garfield's Cabinet tendered their resignations they were requested to retain their places until the meeting of Congress in December. Subsequently the Cabinet was changed, and Mr. Frelinghuysen succeeded Mr. Blaine as Secretary of State. In the session of 1882 two important measures of domestic legislation were carried by Congress. The first was a Bill dealing with the worst phase of the Mormon question by declaring polygamy to be illegal; and the second dealt with Chinese immigration, then as now "a burning question." A Bill was passed providing for the suspension of immigration for a period of ten years, with minor provisions in regard to passports, registration, &c. There was a good deal of diplomatic correspondence at this period with England in relation to Irish affairs, and to our attitude towards American citizens who might visit Ireland for purposes of sedition. Explanations, however, satisfactory and honourable to both Governments, prevented serious complications from arising. A Tariff Bill, with strong leanings in favour of Protection, was passed in 1883; as likewise a Bill providing that, in case of the death, resignation, or inability of the President or Vice-President, the Cabinet officers in succession, beginning with the Secretary of State, should succeed him. In consequence of the repeated dynamite outrages in England, President Arthur issued an order in March 1884 to all the Government officials of the United States, to enforce the existing law with regard to the shipment of explosives; and his action was viewed with cordial satisfaction by this country. The Presidential struggle took place in the ensuing autumn, when Mr. Blaine was nominated as Republican candidate for the Presidency, with General Logan as Vice-President; the Democratic candidates being Governor Cleveland, for President, and Mr. Hendricks, for Vice-President. The Democrats were successful, and Mr. Cleveland became President, after one of the keenest contests on record.

After his retirement from office Mr. Arthur's public appearances were very unfrequent. In his official capacity, he

neither a great nor a brilliant President; but he was eminently practical businesslike, high-minded and durable, and without reproach in fulfilment of his executive duties.

Arthur married, in 1859, Ellen Herndon, of Fredericksburg, Virginia, the daughter of Captain William Herndon, who heroically remained his post and went down with his ship, the *Central America*, in 1857. This lady, who died in 1880, Mr. Adams left a son and a daughter.

Charles Francis Adams, who died at Boston (Mass.) on Nov. 21, was the only son of John Quincy Adams who survived his father. He was born in Boston on Aug. 18, 1807. While still an infant his father took him to St. Petersburg, at which Court the latter was American Ambassador. During a stay of six years here, young Adams learned to speak Russian, German, and French. In 1815 he journeyed with his mother in a private carriage to Paris, a perilous undertaking, in order to meet Mr. Adams. Next he accompanied his father on a mission to England, and in this country he was placed at a boarding-school. The hostility then existing among Englishmen towards the United States was so strong that the young American was compelled to fight with his schoolfellows for the honour of his country; and it is stated that "his physical prowess and patriotic ardour" were such that he was enabled to come out victor in all his contests. Returning to the United States, he studied first at the Boston Latin School, and afterwards at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1825. In 1827 he read law in the office of Daniel Webster, and the following year was admitted to the Boston Bar. In 1829 he married the youngest daughter of Mr. Peter C. Brooks, of Boston, one of the wealthiest men in the United States, and by this marriage he became brother-in-law to Edward Everett.

Mr. Adams began his political career in 1831, when he was elected a representative for Boston to the Massachusetts Legislature. He served in the House for three years, when he was transferred to the Senate, where he further served for two years. He then began to drift away from the Whig party, with whom he had hitherto acted, and in 1848 the newly organised Free Soil party nominated him for the Vice-Presidency of the United States, with Van Buren for President. The Free Soil party, which was chiefly com-

posed of Democrats opposed to the extension of slavery, only cast a few votes. Eventually its members coalesced with the Northern members of the Whig party, forming the Republican party, and this body came into power in 1860. In the interim, Mr. Adams was chosen a representative to Congress by the third district of Massachusetts. His high legal and oratorical powers speedily made their mark, and a speech which he delivered in defence of the Republican party on May 31, 1860, stamped him as one of the ablest members of that party. In company with Mr. Seward, Mr. Adams made a tour of the North-Western States in support of Lincoln for the Presidency. On the opening of the ensuing session he was chosen one of a committee of delegates from each State appointed to take into consideration the condition of the country. Two subjects of great moment were then agitating the United States—viz. New Mexico, and the Slave rights of each State. The committee decided that the Free States should disavow any right to interfere with slavery in the Slave States; recommended the introduction of a Bill for the admission of New Mexico, leaving the question of slavery for the inhabitants to decide; and suggested an amendment to the Constitution forbidding all interference on the part of Congress with slavery in the Slave States. The Bill in connection with New Mexico was thrown out, but the other measures were carried by large majorities—a result mainly due to the convincing arguments and the powerful eloquence of Mr. Adams.

At a very critical period in the relations between England and the United States, Mr. Adams was appointed Minister to this country. Arriving in London in the month of May 1861, in the full tide of the Civil War, he found many of the most influential Englishmen either passively indifferent to, or actively hostile towards, the Federal Power. The course the new Minister was called upon to pursue was a most difficult one: it demanded consideration and urbanity towards those with whom he was constantly brought into contact, and before whom he was urged by his own Government at Washington to abate not a jot of their alleged rights. It was not a little to his credit that he gained the esteem of all classes here for his personal character, where he could not secure unanimity of feeling as regarded his diplomatic action. His knowledge of international law was confessedly wide and profound, and this



was equalled by his excellent temper and discretion. "His influence as a public man was increased by his social qualities, his agreeable conversation, and his familiarity with the whole range of English literature." He conducted an elaborate correspondence with Lord Russell on the subject of the rights of belligerents and neutrals in time of war. He had also many difficult and delicate duties to perform during the continuance of the Civil War, and these he discharged with much tact. An example may be found in connection with the fund of 17,000*l.* raised in England for the relief of Confederate prisoners in the Federal fortresses and gaols. The American Government felt strongly on this subject, told Mr. Adams that all that was fitting to be done with regard to these prisoners would be done without promptings by England, and that they regarded the subscription as an officious interference with their domestic affairs. "I do not think," wrote Mr. Seward, "that the insurgents have become debased, although they have sadly wandered from the ways of loyalty and patriotism. I think that in common with all our countrymen they will rejoice in being saved by their considerate and loyal Government from the grave insult which Lord Wharncliffe and his associates, in their zeal for the overthrow of the United States, have prepared for the victims of this unnatural and hopeless rebellion." These, and other unpleasant assurances, it was Mr. Adams's duty to convey to Southern sympathisers in England, and he achieved his mission without adding to the irritation which already prevailed. He also skilfully conducted the negotiations arising out of the damage inflicted on the American mercantile marine by piratical war steamers equipped at English ports. It was admitted that no ambassador in recent times had ever had to fill a position, not merely so difficult and delicate, but so trying to the equanimity of him who held it, through the rapid and extreme changes of fortune in the State of which he was the mouthpiece. He exercised the finest qualities of true statesmanship just where and when they were of priceless value, and exercised them with complete success.

In the year 1868 Mr. Adams resigned the post of Minister to London, and retired for a time into private life, declining all attempts to bring him forward in connection with administrative affairs in the United States. In

1871, however, on the ratification by England and America of the Treaty of Washington, he consented, at the request of the President, to act as arbitrator for America in the matter of the claims arising out of that treaty. The arbitrators met at Geneva in June 1872. One who was present at the proceedings noted that Mr. Adams spoke the language of Voltaire with as much ease and readiness as his countryman Benjamin Franklin. With regard to the statements of the various arbitrators, that by Mr. Adams was marked by singular ability, though it took rather the politician's than the lawyer's view of the questions at issue, as was most advantageous to the side he represented. He laid special stress on the general disinclination of our scattered home and colonial local authorities to assist in any way the cause of the North, and their "readiness to shelter their partiality under any shadow of legal or administrative justification." The conclusions arrived at by the arbitrators are matter of history.

In 1872 the Executive Committee of the Liberal Republican Convention of Missouri proposed Mr. Adams as a candidate for the Presidency, but he declined to stand. In his letter addressed to Mr. David A. Wells, he said that while grateful for the very flattering estimates made of his services in many and high quarters, he could not consent to peddle with them for power. He valued his independence more highly than the elevation which might be obtained through a sacrifice of it. In 1876 Mr. Adams found himself entirely out of sympathy with the ruling party in the United States, and the Democrats of Massachusetts, aware of this fact, resolved to take a new departure by nominating him as Governor. In presenting his name to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the Convention said there was no need to recite "the public services and private virtues of this illustrious citizen." In accepting the nomination, Mr. Adams remarked that the policy of the ruling party would not tend to the eradication of the great evil which prevailed—viz. the tendency to corruption in official station; neither would it promote the restoration of internal peace and harmony. At the election, which took place in November Mr. Adams received 106,850 votes, against 137,665 recorded for the successful candidate, Mr. Rice.

Mr. Adams rendered a valuable historical and literary service by editing the collected writings and life of his



ublished in ten volumes; ng much light upon the of the American Republic, ulties which attended its

From 1845 to 1848, was the editor of a poli- per at Boston, by which l to pave the way for the Republican party. This er, as we have seen, he e in life, throwing in his th the Democrats. Mr. ublished in 1874-76 "The s of John Quincy Adams," olumes. He also wrote a , grandmother, the wife of resident, which was pub- er with her letters in

left two sons, John Quincy Charles Francis Adams, have earned distinction d political circles in the

William Barrington, Vis- gton, of Ardglass, county aron Barrington of New- / Dublin, in the peerage d Baron Shute, of Beckett, of the United Kingdom, est of the four sons of el, sixth Viscount, by his izabeth, fourth daughter enry, first Lord Ravens- as born Feb. 14, 1824. He time private secretary to of Derby. He was an un- didate in the Conserva- for Buckingham in May ined a seat in the House for Eye in July 1866, and at borough till his eleva- House of Lords in April e death of his father in e succeeded to the Irish was created a baron of Kingdom in the spring of emainder to his brother), and title of Baron Shute, rks, by which title he held he House of Lords. On of Mr. Disraeli's Admin- 1874, he was appointed rlain of her Majesty's hen he was made a Privy which Court appointment he change of Government June 1885, when the first ministration came into Barrington was appointed e Yeomen of the Guard, cond Government he held nent of Captain of the of Gentlemen-at-Arms, up

to the date of his death. He mar- ried, Feb. 19, 1846, Isabel Elizabeth, only child of the late Mr. John Morritt, of Rokeby Hall, York. He was taken ill whilst with Lord Aveland's shooting party at Grimsthorpe, and died after a few hours' illness on Nov. 6, aged 62.

Sir James Martin, Chief Justice of New South Wales, died at Sydney on Nov. 4. He was a son of Mr. John Martin, formerly of Fermoy, Ireland, and was born in the year 1820. He received his education at the College of Sydney, and was a solicitor of the Su- preme Court of New South Wales, from 1845 down to 1856, when he was called to the Australian Bar. He was made a Q.C. in 1857, and was a member of the Legislature of New South Wales, repre- senting the constituency of Cork and Westmoreland from 1848 down to 1859, when the electorates were rearranged. He successively represented East Sydney, Orange, the Lachlan, again East Sydney, and lastly East Macquarie from 1859 to 1873, with the exception of about a year, when he had no seat. Between 1856 and 1878 he held the post of Attorney-General of New South Wales no fewer than four times, and during four of these years he was Pre- mier. In 1870 he was appointed At- torney-General for the fifth time and Premier for the third time, and this office he held till 1872. In 1873 he was appointed Chief Justice of the Su- preme Court of New South Wales. He was elected a member of the Senate of Sydney University in 1858, and in 1865 was specially authorised to retain the title of "Honourable," after ceasing to hold the position of an executive councillor. In 1853 he married Isabella, eldest daughter of Mr. William Long, a merchant of Sydney. He received the honour of knighthood in 1869.

Frederick J. Archer, born on Jan. 11, 1857, was the son of William Archer, of Cheltenham, a celebrated cross-country rider, who had piloted Little Charley to victory in the Liverpool Grand National Steeplechase in 1858. On Jan. 10, 1868, Archer was apprenticed to Matthew Dawson at Newmarket for the term of five years, and on Sept. 28, 1870, he rode his first race in public, when he steered Athol Daisy, 6st. 5lb., to victory in the Nursery Handicap at Chesterfield. It is stated, however, that he had pre- viously ridden with success a pony for Mrs. Willan in a pony race, and that lady claimed to have given Archer his first winning mount. The next day

after Athol Daisy's victory at Chesterfield Archer rode her in the Hartington Plate, and he figured unsuccessfully in 14 other races before the close of the season. He rode 36 times in 1871, and scored three wins in unimportant events. In 1872 he won 25 races out of 136 mounts, and carried off the Cesarewitch on Mr. J. Radcliff's Salvanos, 5st. 7lb., by four lengths, beating a field of 23 runners. In 1873 he had a large number of mounts, but his principal success was when he rode Kingcraft in the Great Lancashire Handicap at the Liverpool Autumn Meeting.

It was in 1874 that he first made his mark on a winner of any of the great three-year-old races of the year, and, on the death of T. French, Lord Falmouth entrusted him with the riding of his horses. At the Newmarket First Spring Meeting he won the Batthyany Sweepstakes on Lady Love for Lord Falmouth, and the next day carried off the Two Thousand Guineas on Atlantic, his bodily weight at the time being as nearly as possible 6st. In 1875 he won the Newmarket International Handicap on Peeping Tom, but was unplaced in the Two Thousand Guineas on Garterly Bell. He rode Spinaway to victory in the One Thousand Guineas, ran third for the Derby on the Repentance colt to Galopin and Claremont, winning the Oaks the next day but one on Spinaway, and the Epsom Cup on Modena. He won the City and Suburban Handicap on Thunder in 1876, but was unplaced in the Two Thousand Guineas on Fetterlock. On Skylark he was beaten off in the Derby, but won the Ascot Gold Vase on Thunder and the Ebor Handicap on Lilian.

In 1877 he won his first Derby on Lord Falmouth's Silvio, and also his first St. Leger on the same colt. He was successful in the City and Suburban Handicap at Epsom on Mr. Gee's Julius Cæsar, and in the Two Thousand Guineas was third on Silvio. In the year 1878 he rode second on Lord Falmouth's Janette in the One Thousand to Pilgrimage, but won the Oaks and the St. Leger on the same filly. He was third on Childeric to Sefton and Insulaire in the Derby, but carried off the Royal Hunt Cup at Ascot on Julius Cæsar, the Coronation Stakes on Redwing, and the Fern Hill Stakes on Lady Lumley.

He was less successful in important races in 1879, though he won the Two Thousand Guineas on Charibert, the One Thousand on Wheel of Fortune, the City and Suburban on Parole, and at Chester he also carried off the Great

Cheshire Stakes on Parole. In 1880 he carried off the City and Suburban on Master Kildare after a masterly finish, and the same may be said of his winning of the Derby on the Duke of Westminster's Bend Or. On the last-named horse he won the City and Suburban in 1881, having then been successful in that race five times out of six years. In the same year he won the Derby on Iroquois, and the Prince of Wales's Stakes at Ascot and the St. Leger on the same horse. In 1882 he won the Woodcote Stakes at Epsom, but was unsuccessful on Dutch Oven in the Derby, though he carried off the St. Leger with her when every one thought she had no chance. He won the Two Thousand Guineas in 1883 on Galliard, but could get no nearer than third to St. Blaise and Highland Chief in the Derby, and, though Galliard won the Prince of Wales's Stakes at Ascot, he broke down before the St. Leger. In 1884 he rode second on St. Medard to Scot Free in the Two Thousand Guineas, but carried off the Epsom Grand Prize on Cherry, and was second to Busybody on Superba for the Oaks Stakes, and won the Dewhurst Plate on Paradox. In 1885 he won the Two Thousand Guineas on Paradox, and on Melton carried off the Derby by a head from his former mount Paradox, who was ridden by Webb. He carried off the Doncaster St. Leger on Melton, and the Middle Park and Dewhurst Plates on Minting and Ormonde. In 1886 he rode Saraband in the Two Thousand Guineas, but was on Ormonde when he won the Derby and St. Leger. He won the Jockey Club Cup on St. Gatien, and on St. Mirin was second in the Cambridgeshire to the Sailor Prince; the last race he rode in at Newmarket was the Houghton Stakes, won by Lord Falmouth's Blanchland.

His list was:—1870, 2; 1871, 3; 1872, 25; 1873, 107; 1874, 147; 1875, 172; 1876, 207; 1877, 218; 1878, 229; 1879, 197; 1880, 120; 1881, 220; 1882, 210; 1883, 232; 1884, 241; 1885, 246; 1886, 170—making a total of 2,746. On the whole he won the Two Thousand Guineas five times, the One Thousand Guineas twice, the Derby five times, the Oaks four times, and the St. Leger six times. Archer's great successes were due to his being a most consummate judge of pace, and in this respect he was very like Francis Buckle, the celebrated jockey, who took long odds he would win the Derby and Oaks of 1802 upon Tyrant and Scotia, horses which were generally considered to have no chance, and won them both. His nerve was of iron, and

er hesitated to take the inside of n at Tattenham Corner, to come top speed down the bend of the hile more mature jockeys, afraid ir necks, were taking wide bends the corner and losing lengths and he race by the manœuvre. He married on Jan. 31, 1883, to Miss Nellie Dawson, eldest daughter of John Dawson, of Warren House, Market, but she died within the leaving behind her an infant ter.

Oct. 18, Archer visited Ireland purpose of riding Cambusmore d Londonderry in the Lieutenant's at the Curragh. He attained the of his visit, as Cambusmore won ce easily, and, after a couple of mounts the same afternoon, he ed home in order to ride St. Mirin e Cambridgeshire at something ie horse's handicapped weight. underwent great privation, and ee consecutive days went without ot a bit of any sort passing his while, on the other hand, he dosed f with trying medicines and spent t part of his time in the Turkish ttached to his private residence outh House. By these means able to ride St. Mirin at 8st. 7lb., over weight, in the Cambridge- but the effort cost him his life, eft him in such a weak state of that after riding at Brighton and first day of the Lewes races he mpelled to relinquish his profes- duties and seek rest at home. A erminating in congestion of the followed, and the doctors thought sable to await the development of ease. Being left on Nov. 8 for a nutes by his nurse, with only his ie diverted her attention momen- o the window, and suddenly get- t of bed possessed himself of a r he kept in his bedroom. His seeing what he had done, sprang s him, but Archer, as she caught him, put the barrel of the pistol mouth and fired. When the arrived he pronounced death to en almost instantaneous.

**Earl of Enniskillen.**—Willoughby arl of and Viscount Enniskillen ron Mountflorece, in the peerage nd, Baron Grinstead, of Wilts, peerage of the United King- as born Jan. 25, 1807, and suc- his father, the third earl, on 31, 1840. He married, first, Jane, aughter of Mr. James A. Casa- who died in May 1855, and

secondly, in Sept. 1865, the Hon. Mary Emma Brodrick, eldest daughter and co-heiress of Charles, sixth Viscount Midleton. Lord Enniskillen was a nobleman of considerable attainments and of highly cultivated taste. He represented Fermanagh in the House of Commons from 1831 to 1840, and, after his succession to his father's title and estates, lived almost constantly in Ireland. He was held in high esteem by all parties as a resident nobleman of great kindness and generosity, who faithfully fulfilled his social duties and endeavoured to promote the best interests of the people among whom he lived. Although his political opinions were of a pronounced character, and he occupied the position of Grand Master of the Orange Institution, his genial courtesy and benevolence disarmed all personal hostility, and conciliated the good feeling of those who differed from him in creed and politics. As the head of the Orange party his influence was always exercised in the interests of moderation and forbearance, while maintaining an uncompromising attitude upon questions which touched their loyal principles. His rank, ripe experience, and active sympathy with their cause gave great weight to his opinion, and his advice was always received with deference and confidence. He died at his residence, Florence Court, co. Fermanagh, on Nov. 12, aged 76.

**John Bramley-Moore**, who died at Brighton on Nov. 19, in his 86th year, was in early life commercially connected with Brazil, and for several years lived at Rio Janeiro. In 1828 many of the officers who formed part of the *Beagle* and *Adventurer* expeditions, under the late Admiral Fitzroy (of which Darwin was the naturalist), were hospitably received by him at Rio on their return from the Straits of Magellan, when they were suffering from scurvy. Soon after his return to England, in 1835, he settled in Liverpool. In 1841 he was elected an alderman, and filled that office for twenty-four years. In 1846, having been elected chairman of the Liverpool Docks, he brought forward his scheme of dock extension, in which he foretold what would be the future requirements of the docks. The following is an account of his first interview with Lord Derby (the grandfather of the present Earl) at Knowsley on the subject:—"I have come, my lord, to ask you to give me the north shore, together with its lordships and rights, and it will be greatly to the gain of the

family for you to do so." His lordship, somewhat surprised, replied, "I think you will have some difficulty in convincing me of that: I have been offered by others 90,000*l.* for the grounds in these quarters." "If you will give me," continued the chairman, "the foreshore for such a distance, I will make for you all the back land behind, with the spoil of the docks, and this land will be your compensation, and will become of immense value, soon, if not in your lifetime, being enhanced in value by the docks which I propose to construct." The result of the interview was that the Earl gave the chairman what he asked for, so that this long line of river frontage, to the extent of about two miles, did not cost the estate a penny. The project excited in the first instance the greatest opposition, but the Act of Parliament for the enlargement of the docks was, after a great deal of severe Parliamentary labour, obtained in 1846. The result has fully justified the wisdom and foresight of the arrangement. A notable event in the history of the Liverpool Docks was the opening of the Albert Dock in 1846, when Prince Albert went down for the ceremony, and was entertained by the dock committee and by the mayor. Mr. Bramley-Moore, the chairman, and Mr. David Hodgson, the mayor, were offered the honour of knighthood, which, however, was respectfully declined in both instances. Mr. Bramley-Moore was present, in September 1881, at the opening of new docks in Liverpool by the Prince of Wales. These were but the continuation and crown of the scheme which he initiated in 1846, and which Mr. Jesse Hartley carried out. In 1849 Mr. Bramley-Moore was Mayor of Liverpool, and during his term of office did much to enliven the ordinary routine of municipal hospitality. In politics he was a Conservative, and in 1854 he was returned to Parliament as member for Maldon, which he represented to the year 1859. He also represented the city of Lincoln from 1862 to 1865. He contested unsuccessfully Hull, Liverpool, and Lymington. In 1863 he made a speech on the subject of the relations of England with Brazil, as a serious misunderstanding had arisen between the two countries. This speech was most warmly received in Brazil, and Mr. Bramley-Moore received addresses from twenty-five of the largest and most important provinces, and the dignity of the Imperial Order of the Rose from the reigning Emperor, the highest which the laws admit of being conferred upon a foreigner. When his

Majesty was over in England in 1877, he went down to Gerrard's Cross to lunch with Mr. Bramley-Moore. It has to be added that the latter was a magistrate for Lancashire and Buckingham, and a deputy-lieutenant for Lancashire.

The Right Hon. Acton Smee Ayrton, whose death took place at the Mont Dore Hotel, Bournemouth, on the 30th, was a son of Mr. Frederick Ayrton, at one time of Bombay, by marriage with Julia, only daughter of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Nugent, and was born at Kew in 1816. He went to India early in life, and practised as a solicitor at Bombay, whence he returned with a modest fortune, and a large store of general and special knowledge. In 1853 he was called to the Bar at the Middle Temple, and four years later was elected member for the Tower Hamlets in the Liberal interest. Under Mr. Gladstone he was Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury from the end of 1868 till the following November, Chief Commissioner of Public Works and Buildings from the last date to the summer of 1873, and Judge Advocate-General from that time until the general election of 1874. He then lost his seat, and did not afterwards return to the House. As a Minister, Mr. Ayrton exhibited a praiseworthy desire to spare the public purse, but he was also a fluent and accurate speaker, a clear reasoner, and a dangerous opponent. His sympathies were rather with economy than with art, and among other retrenchments he cut off the tower from the plan of Mr. Street's new Courts of Justice in the Strand. If anything, he was exhibited to the least advantage in his relations with Alfred Stevens as to the superb Wellington monument now virtually hidden away in St. Paul's Cathedral. In 1870, it appears, the sculptor had received 11-12ths of his inadequate guerdon, 14,000*l.*, without having done more than 7-12ths of the work, on which he bestowed excessive care. Apprised of this, Mr. Ayrton resolved to have the monument finished by another artist, and for this purpose called upon Stevens to give up the models and everything connected therewith. No time was specified in the contract for the completion of the undertaking, but the sculptor, reduced to comparative poverty by unforeseen outlays, was not able to go to law on the subject, and it seemed only too probable that the demand made upon him would not be abandoned. Happily, Mr. Lowe, then Chancellor of the Exchequer,



interposed in behalf of the artist, allowing him to pursue his labours under a few easy conditions. Hardly less disadvantageous to Mr. Ayrton was a controversy he had with the then director of Kew Gardens, Sir Joseph Hooker; but in this and in all his dis-

putes with permanent officials his zeal for public economy was unquestioned. To Mr. Ayrton were due, moreover, the new Post Office buildings in St. Martin's-le-Grand, one of the cheapest and most commodious public buildings in the Metropolis.

During the month the following deaths also occurred:—On the 2nd, at Ascot, aged 54, **James Watney**, of Palace Gate, Kensington, for many years Conservative M.P. for East Surrey, son of the late James Watney, of Haling Park, Surrey, and for many years a member of the firm of Watney & Co., brewers. On the same date, in York Street, Portman Square, aged 76, **Captain Martin Edward Haworth-Leslie**, formerly of Elstree, Herts, son of the late Thomas Haworth. He assumed the name of Leslie in 1882, upon his wife Lady Mary Elizabeth Leslie's succeeding her niece as Countess of Rothes. He was early in life in the 60th Rifles, and was afterwards a Queen's Foreign Service Messenger. On the 3rd, **Dr. Wilhelm Moewe**, or **Moewe-Calbe**, as he was generally called from the constituency he represented in the Frankfort Parliament of 1848. He was 72 years of age. Condemned to penal servitude for life for political offences, he lived out of Prussia until the amnesty of 1861 enabled him to return there, when he joined the National Liberal party, and was for a time Vice-President of the Prussian Lower Chamber. On the same date, at Oak Hill, Surbiton, aged 72, **George Clowes**, the last surviving son of the founder of the printing house of William Clowes & Sons. He was a member of the Society of Arts and of other societies, and took great interest in the scheme for producing the present Law Reports, and in the production of the catalogues and other official publications of the Exhibition of 1851. On the 7th, at Ramsgate, aged 64, **Dr. Edmond Regnier**, who played a singular part in the siege of Metz, gaining entrance to the town as a pretended emissary of the French Empress. He was afterwards prosecuted and condemned by default, and passed the rest of his days in England. On the same date, in Ladbroke Square, aged 81, **Major-General J. T. Boileau**, son of the late Thomas Boileau, of Huguenot descent, a man of high scientific attainments, and a great philanthropist. Also on the same date, at Richmond, Surrey, **Miss Letitia Frances Selwyn**, daughter of the late William Selwyn, Q.C., and the sister of the late Lord Justice Selwyn, and of the late Bishop of New Zealand, and the grand-niece of the celebrated wit George Selwyn. On the 12th, in Dublin, aged 83, **Sir John Francis Lentaigue, C.B.**, Inspector of Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Ireland, and formerly Inspector-General of Prisons, a son of the late Benjamin Lentaigue, M.D., 5th Dragoon Guards. On the 13th, at Sutton, Surrey, aged 86, **George Thomas Doo, R.A.** (retired), a well-known engraver. On the 14th, at Blackrock, near Cork, aged 83, the **Most Reverend Dr. Delaney**, Roman Catholic Bishop of Cork. On the same date, at Meldon Lodge, Cheltenham, aged 79, **Thomas Prendergast**, late of the Madras Civil Service. The son of the late Sir Jeffrey Prendergast, and the father of General Sir Harry Prendergast, V.C., of Burmese fame. He devoted his later life, in spite of the affliction of blindness, to the literary work of improving and popularising what he called the "Mastery system" of learning languages. On the 15th, in Vienna, aged 78, **Baron Gustave Heine Geldern**, the editor and proprietor of the Vienna *Fremdenblatt*. He was a brother of the poet Heinrich Heine, and received the title of Baron in recognition of his services to the Government in placing his journal indifferently at the service of all parties, as the semi-official organ. On the same date, at Bakeham Grange, Egham, aged 56, **Rear-Admiral W. Arthur, C.B.**, a Naval Aide-de-Camp to the Queen. He served in the Baltic and Black Seas during the Russian war, and in China, and was for a time Naval Attaché at Washington. On the 16th, in the Close, Winchester, aged 69, **Bishop Francis Thomas Macdougall**, Archdeacon of the Isle of Wight, and Canon of Winchester. He was educated for the medical profession, and became a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons and Demonstrator of Anatomy at King's College, London, but abandoning medicine he was ordained, and went out with Sir James Brooke to Borneo. He was subsequently appointed Bishop of Labuan, and distinguished himself by his labour in the Malay Archipelago. On his return to England in 1868, he held for a time the living of Godmanchester. On the 17th, aged 76, **Caroline Lady Bucknall-Estcourt**, the widow of Major-General James Bucknall-Estcourt, who died of cholera while serving as Adjutant-General in the Army in the Crimea. His widow was by special provision granted the rank of widow of a



**K.C.B.** She was a daughter of the Right Hon. Reginald Pole-Carew. On the 21st, at Donnington Lodge, Newbury, aged 53, Major-General Sir Francis Worgan Festing, K.C.M.G., C.B., son of Captain Benjamin Morton Festing, B.A. He entered the Royal Marine Artillery, and served in the Baltic and Black Sea campaigns, in China, and throughout the Ashantee War. He subsequently held the appointment of Assistant-Adjutant-General of the Royal Marines, and was made Aide-de-Camp to the Queen. On the 23rd, in Vienna, aged 64, Leopold Kompert, an Austrian novelist whose works dealt almost exclusively with scenes from modern Jewish life. His first work was written when he was in the service of Count Andrassy as house-steward. He afterwards obtained a situation in Baron Rothschild's household, where he was enabled to pursue his literary work at his leisure. On the 24th, in Albemarle Street, aged 84, Francis George Spencer, second Baron Churchill, D.C.L. On the 27th, in Upper Brook Street, aged 72, Octavius Edward Coope, M.P. for the Brentford Division of Middlesex. He was a partner in the great brewing firm of Ind & Coope, of Romford and Burton-on-Trent. On the 28th, in Queensberry Place, aged 80, Sir Alexander Charles Malet, K.C.B., second baronet, of Wilbury House, Wilts, son of the late Sir Charles Warre Malet, of Wilbury House. He entered the diplomatic service at an early age, and after serving in many different Courts was for fourteen years Envoy to the German Confederation.

## DECEMBER.

On Dec. 1, in London, Mrs. Emma Paterson, honorary secretary of the Women's Protective and Provident League, who died very unexpectedly. Born in April 1847, she was identified from her youth with almost all contemporary movements for the amelioration of the political and especially the industrial condition of women. As Miss Emma Smith she was secretary, 20 years ago, of the Women's Suffrage Society, and subsequently held for many years the secretaryship of the Workmen's Club and Institute Union. She thus came into close contact with working men, studied their trade organisations, and fully acquainted herself with the needs of the operative classes. Her marriage, at an early age, to Mr. Thomas Paterson, a cabinet maker, and an earnest practical student of all social and industrial questions, extended her knowledge and sympathies. In 1874 she induced working women for the first time to adopt trade unionist principles, and established the Women's Protective and Provident League for the formation of trade and benefit societies among working women. The London Bookbinders' Union was the earliest women's trade society due to Mrs. Paterson's exertions; the Upholstresses', the Shirtmakers', the Tailoresses and Dressmakers' Union quickly followed. In 1875 Mrs. Paterson was the first woman admitted to the Trade Union Congress, and she attended and spoke or read papers at all the subsequent congresses. As honorary secretary of the Women's League Mrs. Paterson worked indefatigably till almost her last hour: she organised and addressed public meetings in London and the provinces, she arranged social gatherings at the offices of the league, and she edited the *Women's Union Journal*, a monthly record of the league's work. Her husband died in 1882, and Mrs. Paterson edited, with a memoir, a remarkable posthumous work by him entitled "A New Method of Mental Science," which was published early in the present year. At the time of her death she was preparing for the press other of Mr. Paterson's unpublished writings.

**Field-Marshal Sir Richard Dacres, G.C.B.,** Constable of the Tower and Colonel-Commandant Royal Horse Artillery, who died Dec. 6, at Palmeira Square, Brighton, was born in 1799, and was the son of the late Vice-Admiral Sir Richard Dacres, G.C.H., by his wife Martha, whose maiden name was Milligan. Educated at the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, he obtained his commission in the Royal Artillery in 1817. In those days promotion, espe-

cially in the Artillery, was very slow, and he served eight years before he became first lieutenant, and twelve years more before he became captain. In 1851 he obtained his brevet majority, and a few months later lieutenant-colonel in his corps. Up to 1854 the professional life of Lieutenant-Colonel Dacres had been uneventful, save that much of it had been passed in that corps d'élite the Royal Horse Artillery. In that year, however, the Crimean

se out, and he proceeded first to and afterwards to the Crimea in 1 of the Horse Artillery of the nary force. He was present at of Bulganac on Sept. 19, the the Alma, the affair of M'Kenm, the battle of Balaclava, the f the Russian sortie on Oct. 26, commanded the artillery end at Inkerman succeeded to mand of the artillery of the the field on the death of Brigadier Strangways. This position ed throughout the siege of ol with the rank of Brigadier-having become colonel in No-854. His services during the were five times acknowledged ches, and he was rewarded, in to a brevet colonelcy, being K.C.B., Commander of the f Honour, Commander of the of the Military Order of Savoy, ation of 2nd Class of the Med-e Crimean medal with four d the Turkish medal. In 1857 ne colonel in his corps, and 9 till 1865 he was commandant rich. In the latter year he be-jor-general, in 1871 colonel-lant Royal Artillery, in 1872 t-general, on Oct. 1, 1877, nd on the same date was placed tired list. It was only a few before his death that he he coveted bâton of field-mar-1869 he was advanced to the f Grand Cross of the Bath, and as appointed Constable of Her Tower of London. His long urable life was less eventful ht have been imagined from ars bestowed upon him. During 37 as during the last 30 years litary career he never had an ity of seeing a shot fired in t when his opportunity came imea he was ready to profit by owed how successfully in peace epared himself for high com-war. That Sir Richard Dacres's s not latterly familiar to the ublic must be put down, not to nerit, but rather to modesty. ot a man who advertised him-

Minghetti, who died at Rome 10, was born at Bologna on 1818, where his father was a commercial man; but dying : his son's death, the education ter was left to his mother. He sent to any public school or , but at an early age was made

to travel, first through Italy and subsequently over the east of Europe. In 1846 he returned to Bologna, where he read before the local Agricultural Society a paper on the English Corn Laws. He busied himself also with politics, as soon as the election of Pius IX. promised a liberty of speech and thought previously unknown to the States of the Church. In company with some friends Minghetti started a journal, *Il Fel-sineo*, and a few months later he was called to Rome, to take his seat on a Council of Finance, appointed to inquire into existing abuses. He joined the Lay Ministry in the following year as Minister of Public Works, the Pope having announced the grant of a new constitution to his subjects on a representative basis. In this office Minghetti distinguished himself as an administrative reformer till the Encyclical of April 29, 1848, ended the Ministry of which he was a member, and destroyed the hopes founded by the Liberals on the disposition of the Pope. Minghetti immediately took service under Charles Albert, made the campaign of 1848, and was decorated after the battles of Goito and Custozza. The peace of Milan followed, and he returned, not to Rome, where a seat in Rossi's Cabinet was offered to him, but to his economic studies at Bologna, which were continued for several years, uninterrupted except by occasional visits to his friend Cavour, by whom he was summoned to Paris to assist him during the Congress. His reputation as an authority on finance was further increased by the appearance early in 1859 of his important work on "Political Economy, and its Relation to Morals and Justice." He was travelling in the East when events brought him back to Italy. Tuscany, Parma, Modena, and Bologna declared in favour of a united Italy under Victor Emmanuel, and Cavour appointed him Secretary to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. From this time statesmanship rather than literature was the business of his life, and his name is connected with every important event in Italian politics. He held his secretaryship till the peace of Villafranca, and then became member and president of the Assembly of Romagna, and was associated with General Fanti in the military organisation of Modena, Parma, and the Romagna, which were formed into the new province of Æmilia. This congenial work gave a great impetus to the movement of annexation and consolidation, and when it was completed Minghetti was

returned to the national Italian Parliament as member for his native city.

Henceforth, the struggle for national unity being over, Minghetti played an honourable part in all the public affairs of his country, and was never absent from Parliament except during his two short diplomatic missions to London and Vienna, in 1868 and 1870 respectively. He was Minister of the Interior in Cavour's last Government and in that of Baron Ricasoli, and he was at one time or another Vice-President of the Parliament, President of the Ministry, with the portfolio of Finance, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Finance, and again President of the Ministry. His second Ministry, upon the fall of which he did not return to office, lasted from July 1873 to March 1876, when he was succeeded by Signor Depretis. In politics Minghetti belonged to what is known as the Right Centre, but men of all parties deplored the loss of so conspicuous a statesman, though, as far as possible, his dying request to the President of the Chamber that no speech should be made on his death was observed.

The Cardinal Vicar sent to him a priest when death was approaching to administer the last sacrament, but he, not desirous to accept the Vatican formula, which prescribes repentance for the usurpation of the States of the Church, refused to see him, and received it at the hands of the King's chaplain.

In addition to the writings mentioned, Minghetti was the author of two other works, "*Le donne italiane nelle belle arti al secolo xv.*" (1877), and "*La Chiesa e lo Stato*" (1878).

**Johann Nicolai Madvig.**—This great scholar, who died at Copenhagen on Dec. 12, was born, under the most humble circumstances, on August 7, 1804, in Svaneke, a small borough on the island of Bornholm, in the Baltic, where his father held the modest office of town and court clerk. The boy was clever and precocious; at a little more than ten years he had to begin work at the office, and during his father's illness, which soon after ended with his death, he virtually had to act on his behalf. Some citizens of the small borough, in whose marketplace has since been erected a bust of its most distinguished son, clubbed together in order to send him to a public grammar school. He went from there to the University at the age of sixteen, and was only twenty-one when he passed his final examination in the classics, and the year after he became tutor in Latin philology, very soon ex-

changing this place for a regular professorship. At the time of his death he could consequently look back upon a University career of fully 60 years. As a critic of texts and a reconstructor of corrupt readings Madvig attained his highest reputation. He brought to this work a scrupulous exactitude, a marvellous knowledge of the spirit of the language and of the peculiarities of style of each author, and last, not least, a most happy gift of conjecture, always tempered by sober discretion, but often solving, with the happy ease of genius, difficulties and riddles that had puzzled scholars for centuries. This was only part of a laborious study aiming at penetrating the real core and spirit of the classical languages and at reconstructing, together with the texts, the life, the customs, the institutions, the political, intellectual, and moral features of classical antiquity. His first challenge to the old school of philologists was given in his "*Epistola Critica ad Orellium*," in which he threw down the gauntlet to several German scholars, and it was only after a hard and prolonged contest that he prevailed and saw his principles adopted as standard rules. Cicero and Livy are the two Latin authors owing most to his critical treatment of their extant works; Madvig's edition of "*M. Tullii Ciceronis De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum Libri Quinque*" stands unrivalled for careful and sagacious treatment of the conflicting texts and for the clearness of the commentaries. The "*Emendationes Livianæ*," published in 1860, have done much for this author. But his field of investigation embraced the whole extent of classical literature, and his "*Adversaria Critica*," of which the third volume appeared a year before his death, contains a treasury of emendations and elucidations to a large number of authors.

Madvig's "*Latin Grammar*," the first edition of which appeared shortly after 1840, translated into most modern languages, is recognised as of the first importance to teachers all over the world. His "*Greek Syntax*" is formed on the same plan and is a marvellous proof of his linguistic penetration and logical thinking. Under his guidance classical studies everywhere made a new start, and under his own eyes a young school of Danish philologists was formed, who are diligently working in the groove indicated by him. With his hearers and disciples Madvig always stood in the most lively and sympathetic relations; he did everything to help

and, intellectually and materially, by worshipped him as a superior. All through his life, especially in his old age, he was the guide and friend of his students; for a long period of years he was chief inspector of grammar schools, and in this capacity he supervised the examinations for admission to the University and exerted a considerable influence on the methods of instruction. A student he remained to the last day of his life. Many years of failing eyesight deprived him of the privilege of reading, worth to him more than to most others, and everything had to be read to him, while he could entertain his own thoughts by dictating, so that it seemed as if this trial only confirmed his marvellous memory and preserved all his mental faculties. He continued his studies with undiminished vigour, and his contributions to science were frequent and as valuable as in his youth. Only a few weeks before his death he took part in a meeting of the Philologists' Society, and delivered a paper upon political pamphlets in the history of literature.

His vigour, though spending so large a portion of his life with past and bygone times, was as an ardent patriot, and for many years he was closely connected with the political life of Denmark. From 1849 to 1851 he was Minister of Education and Public Instruction, and his name is appended to the Charter of 1849, which is still the corner-stone of Danish constitutional liberty. After 1851 he had a seat in Parliament, and several times Speaker of the House, during the years of struggle before the death of King Frederick VII., when Danish and the German subjects of the empire were thrown together in the same Parliament, he was nominated President of this heterogeneous assembly, discharging his difficult function with rare tact and never-failing energy. At the age of 70 he retired from active politics, but he never ceased to take with keen interest the evolution of political life, and shortly before his death he wrote a pamphlet disavowing a judgment rendered by the Supreme Court, in which he saw a departure from the true spirit of the Danish constitution.

While Conservative in views, and extremely cautious in acting, he did not disagree with the present system of government, and advised a prudent policy in order to conciliate the conflicting tendencies.

He received many distinctions, having all the degrees of the Danish Order, bestowed on him, he was

made a Privy Councillor of the first class and decorated with the Order of the Elephant, with the title of Excellency. He wore, besides the German order *Pour le Mérite*, the Russian White Eagle, the Swedish North Star, the Norwegian St. Olaf, the French Legion of Honour, and several other Orders of an inferior degree. The distinctions offered to him by foreign Universities, scientific societies, and public institutions were innumerable. When, as the representative of Danish science, he attended, some ten or twelve years ago, the festival of the venerable University at Leyden, he was greeted with the acclamations of the distinguished assembly as *facile princeps* among the then living investigators of classical antiquity. And in 1879, when his own University celebrated its 400th anniversary and had selected him to represent on that memorable occasion, as Rector Magnificus, the high school he had done so much to honour and to adorn, the same universal acknowledgment was vouchsafed to him by the eminent delegates of European science.

Sir Douglas Forsyth, C.B., K.C.S.I., who died at Eastbourne on Dec. 24, was the younger son, the elder being Mr. William Forsyth, Q.C., of the late Mr. Thomas Forsyth, of Liverpool, and he was born in 1827. He was first educated at Rugby, and then went through the usual course at Haileybury before entering the Bengal Civil Service, which he did in 1848. He entered the service when the final conquest of the Punjab was in progress, and on the eve of the formation of the junior division of the Civil Service. At a very early stage of his career he was sent to this new province, the organisation of which Lord Dalhousie entrusted to the very ablest men at his disposal, and when the mutiny broke out nine years after his arrival he was acting as Deputy Commissioner in the Cis-Sutlej States—his superior, or the full Commissioner, being Mr. George Barnes. The principal duty that devolved upon these officials was to provide means of transport for the troops ordered from the Punjab to Delhi, but on their tact and firmness also depended to a great extent the attitude of the protected Sikh States. Mr. Forsyth took a bold initiative in calling upon the Maharajah of Puttiala for assistance, and the appeal, being promptly responded to by that loyal chieftain, awakened a responsive echo in the other Sikh chiefs of



Jheend and Nabha. His measures for the defence of Umballa were prompt and sufficient. He raised a police force of Sikhs for the purpose, and under the direction of the Commissioner, Mr. George Barnes, it was he who provided for the security of the road from Umballa to Kurnaul up to the siege and capture of Delhi. The reputation he gained during the mutiny (and for his services he received the C.B.) insured his rapid promotion, until he became in due course Commissioner of the very important district of Umballa. But in 1869 a still more important subject than the management of the Sikhs had come to the front, and that was our future relations with Russia. Lord Mayo had just received the Ameer Shere Ali in durbar at Umballa, and, as it was considered desirable to bring the views of the Indian Government on the Central Asian question in a clear and unmistakable form before that of St. Petersburg, Mr. Forsyth was considered the most competent person to be entrusted with the responsible duty of Indian envoy to the Russian Court. There can be no doubt he fully justified the confidence thus reposed in him, as he established the very basis of the arrangement which, despite the rapid progress of Russian arms in the interval, was carried out in the subsequent agreement to delimit the Afghan frontier by a joint Commission. The main point which he then established was that Russia consented to respect the territory then in the possession of Shere Ali, and the danger and difficulties of negotiating with Russia upon any other basis have received ample proof.

Immediately after his return to India Mr. Forsyth was entrusted with a second mission, more interesting in its surroundings if less important in its consequences than his visit to St. Petersburg. The travels of Mr. Shaw had introduced to us the little-known country of Chinese or Eastern Turkestan and its famous ruler, the Atalik Ghazi, or Yakoob Beg. An envoy from this potentate visited India, and Mr. Forsyth was sent on a return mission to Yarkand. Unfortunately, Yakoob Beg was engaged in a distant campaign, and Mr. Forsyth, whose instructions required his return to India before the commencement of winter, had to return without accomplishing the main object of his journey. The only satisfactory result of the mission was that he learnt something definite about a State which at the time was neither Russian nor Chinese. Three years later Mr. Forsyth was sent on a

second mission to Kashgar, not merely that he might complete his observations of the earlier date, but also that he might acquire a precise knowledge of what the future relations of Russia with this State would be, for at that moment Kashgar, not less than Khiva, stood under the menace of Russian invasion. At all events, he was successful in seeing the Atalik Ghazi on this occasion, and he visited both Yarkand and Kashgar. His report on the mission forms a most useful guide to the politics, natural history, and physical condition of Eastern Turkestan. For this mission he was rewarded with the K.C.S.I. His diplomatic work did not end here, for in 1875 he went to Burmah, chiefly to obtain an explanation of the King's reception of Lisitai and to effect a settlement of the Karennee question. This mission was denounced as a failure, and Sir Douglas Forsyth came in for some unfriendly criticism; but he printed for private circulation a succinct and really unanswerable account of his conduct during his journey to Burmah and of the proper execution of his mission. Shortly after this he retired from the service, and since his return to England took a prominent and active part as director of several of the larger Indian railways. He married, in 1850, Alice, daughter of the late Mr. Thos. Plumer, of Canons, Middlesex, by whom he left three daughters.

Senator John Alexander Logan, whose death occurred at New York on Dec. 26, had a distinguished career both as soldier and statesman. Born in Jackson county, Illinois, in 1826, he graduated at the Louisville University in 1852, and was admitted to the Bar. He sat in the State Legislature for five years, and in 1858 was elected to Congress as a Democrat, being re-elected in 1860. On the news of trouble in the South Mr. Logan declared that in the event of the election of Abraham Lincoln he would "shoulder his musket to have him inaugurated." In July 1861, during the extra session of Congress, he left the House, joined the troops that were marching out of Washington to meet the enemy, and fought with great bravery at the disastrous battle of Bull Run, being among the last to leave the field. Resigning his seat in Congress, as he believed he could serve his country better in the field, Mr. Logan organised the 31st Illinois Infantry, and was appointed its colonel. He led his regiment at Belmont, Fort Henry, and Fort Donelson, being severely wounded while leading the assault at the latter place.



g laid aside for a time he re-  
imself for duty to General  
March 1862, and was made a  
General of Volunteers. He  
n the command at Jackson,  
a. Urged to become a candi-  
Congress, he replied, "I have  
ie field to die, if need be, for  
ernment, and never expect to  
peaceful pursuits until the  
this war of preservation has  
fact established." Logan ex-  
ich skill and bravery that he  
his promotion as Major-General  
teers in November 1862. In  
ring June his column was the  
ster the captured city of Vicks-  
d he was made its military

General Logan succeeded  
Sherman in command of the  
y Corps in November 1863.  
1864 he joined General Sher-  
ny, and fought three successful  
nts. At Atlanta, when General  
n fell in the hottest of the  
gan took the command, and  
this desperate battle showed  
ability and courage that had  
ised him as the commandant  
s or division. His troops sub-  
accompanied General Sher-  
is famous "march to the sea"  
nah, and he remained in active  
with Sherman's army till the  
of the Confederate forces  
neral Johnston, April 26, 1865.  
e active service of the war was  
esigned his commission, stating

that he did not wish to draw pay when  
not on active duty. President Johnson  
offered him the post of Minister to  
Mexico, but he declined the appointment.  
In 1866 he was elected by Illinois to  
Congress as a Republican, and in 1871  
he was chosen by the Illinois Legisla-  
ture a Senator of the United States. In  
the following year he succeeded Vice-  
President Wilson as Chairman of the  
Senate Committee on Military Affairs.  
Mr. Logan was again chosen United  
States Senator in 1879 and 1885. He  
made many remarkable speeches, first,  
as a representative, on Reconstruction,  
on the Impeachment of President John-  
son, the principles of the Democratic  
party, and removing the Capitol; and,  
secondly, as a Senator, in his Vindica-  
tion of Grant against Sumner, on the  
Equalisation of Bounties, on the Power  
of the Government to enforce United  
States Laws, the FitzJohn Porter case,  
&c. General Logan was a forcible and  
effective speaker. In person he is de-  
scribed as having been "a man of fine  
presence, rendered striking by his jet-  
black hair and strongly marked features.  
He possessed in a high degree those  
traits of character which win success—  
a strong personal magnetism, undaunted  
courage, and untiring industry." He  
married in 1855 Miss Mary Cunning-  
ham, a daughter of Captain Cunning-  
ham, of Shawneetown, Illinois, and a  
lady of superior education and rare  
social qualities.

g the month the following deaths also occurred:—On the 1st, at Kings-  
land, Sir Samuel Lee Anderson, Crown Solicitor for the counties of  
d and Kilkenny, and subsequently at Dublin Castle. On the same date,  
stead, aged 69, Mark Anthony, who in early life was in the first rank of  
andscape painters. On the 3rd, aged 57, General François Gabriel Pittie,  
the Military Household of President Grévy, and General Secretary to the  
y. He had served with distinction in the Crimean and Franco-German  
l was also a writer of poems, both translations and original. On the 4th,  
ton Square, aged 72, Arthur Grote, F.R.S., F.L.S., a writer upon subjects  
d with botany and natural history. He was for many years in the Indian  
vice. On the 5th, at Bushy Park, Enniskerry, co. Wicklow, aged 81, Sir  
mnes Twistleton Crampton, K.C.B., second Baronet, son of the late Sir  
rampton, Surgeon-in-Ordinary to the Queen in Ireland. He entered the  
ic service, and served therein for 43 years, having been successively  
Plenipotentiary at Washington, Hanover, St. Petersburg, and Madrid,  
in 1869. On the 6th, at Inverness, aged 84, Horatio Ross, a famous  
n. He was the winner of the first recorded steeplechase, and was a well-  
achtsman and game-shot. On the 7th, at Wimbledon, aged 53, Major  
O'Brien Taylor, Standard Bearer of Her Majesty's Honourable Corps of  
an-at-Arms, son of the late Major William Stanhope Taylor. He  
he army in 1852, and served in the Crimean and Indian Mutiny cam-  
On the 10th, at Hardwicke Court, Gloucester, aged 79, Thomas Barwick  
aker, a distinguished philanthropist, to whose persevering advocacy,  
ther improvements in our criminal administration, the reformatory school  
was wholly due. On the 10th, in Guernsey, aged 65, General John Elias  
C.B., late of 83rd Regiment. He had served in the Crimean campaign,

and in the Indian Frontier war of 1863. On the 11th, at Rome, aged 70, Cardinal Giovanni Battista Franzelin, a distinguished statesman and a prominent member of the Society of Jesuits. On the 12th, at Attenberg, Countess Beust, the widow of the Count Beust, whom she survived but a few weeks. On the 17th, at Brighton, aged 51, Sir Edmund Filmer, of Sutton Place, Staplehurst, ninth Baronet, formerly M.P. for Western and for Mid-divisions of Kent; for some years he held a commission in the Grenadier Guards. On the 24th, at Twickenham, aged 64, Francis Francis, many years the editor of the angling columns of the *Field* newspaper, and an author of numerous works on fish and fishing. On the 26th, at Warrington, aged 46, John Warrington Wood, of Villa Campana, Rome, an eminent sculptor. On the same date, at Uplands, Bridgwater, aged 81, Sir James Dalrymple Horn Elphinstone, second Baronet, of Horn and Logie, Elphinstone, Aberdeenshire. He was many years M.P. for Portsmouth, and served as a Lord of the Treasury from 1874 to 1880. On the 27th, at Eastbourne, aged 79, Colonel Godfrey Greene, C.B., R.E., son of the late Major Anthony Green, of the Honourable East India Company's Service. He went out to Bengal, and, after holding various posts as executive engineer, became secretary to the Military Board at Calcutta, and Master of the Mint. After his retirement, he was for 15 years director of engineering and architectural works to the Admiralty. On the 29th, at Wilderhope House, Shrewsbury, aged 80, the Rev. Thomas Butler, F.R.G.S., Honorary Canon of Lincoln Cathedral, and for forty years rector of Langar-with-Barnston. He was the son of the late Right Rev. Dr. Samuel Butler, many years Head-Master of Shrewsbury School, and afterwards Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

# INDEX.

The figures between [ ] refer to PART I.

**ABERDEEN**, Lord, ovation on his quitting Dublin, 85

— Upper Kirkgate, discovery of silver coins, 23

**ACCIDENTS**.—Almy, Wyoming, colliery explosion, 3; Altofts, near Wakefield, colliery explosion, 45; Baku, vessel blown to atoms, 14; Belfast, collapse of Albert Bridge, 42; Berlin to Stuttgart, railway collision, 29; Chicago, dynamite explosion, 39; Craræ Granite Quarries, deaths from choke-damp, 44; Dean Lane Colliery, Bedminster, explosion, 41; Dieppe, boiler explosion, 35; Elmore Colliery, Hetton, explosion, 57; Essen Colliery, explosion, 43; Excursion train from Erie to Niagara, collision, 42; Great Eastern Railway, collision, 2; Havre, dynamite and gunpowder explosion, 33; Hobart Town, train left the line, 29; Holloway Road, fall of houses, 5; Hong Kong, Nordenfelt gun explosion, 13; Houghton Main Colliery, fall of cage, 61; Knockbridge, train left the line, 28; M'Cainsville, New Jersey, dynamite explosion, 29; Norwich, Victoria Station, gas explosion, 5; Panama Canal, gunpowder explosion, 14; Ostrau, Moravia, fall of bridge, 42; Pittsburg, train struck by a mass of earth, 54; Portage, Wisconsin, railway collision, 50; Portland Place, gas explosion, 51; Roquebrune and Monte Carlo, passenger train collision, 11; Serpentine, ice gave way, 2; Sisteron, Basses Alpes, train buried by fall of mountain, 53; steamtug, boiler explosion, 11; West Leigh, colliery explosion, 37

**DAMS v. Coleridge**, verdict for defendants, 55

**ADMINISTRATION**, the New, 37

**ÆRONAUTICS**, Mr. L'Hoste and Mr. Maryot, ascent from Cherbourg, 35

**AFGHANISTAN** [417].—BOUNDARY Commission [418]; Ghilzais, outbreak of the [417]; North-West Frontier [418]; Northern Frontier [418]; Penjdeh taken by the Russians [414]

**AFRICA**. *Vide* Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Cape Colony, Congo, Egypt, Madagascar, Mauritius, Natal, Transvaal, Zululand

— **CENTRAL** [461].—Convention between Portugal and Germany to define boundary [462]; Emin Bey, his

**AFRICA, CENTRAL**, *continued*

bravery and endurance [461]; Hannington, Bishop, his murder [461]

— **WEST COAST** [460]; France and Germany, agreement about territories [460]; line of demarcation extended [460]; Money Bimbia destroyed [461]; telegraphic communication opened with England, 84

**ALDERSHOT**, review held by the Queen in honour of the Colonial and Indian representatives, 29; military riot at, 46

**ALLSOP**, Sir H., made a peer, 6

**AMERICA, SOUTH** [487]. *Vide* Brazil, Canada, Chili and Peru, Mexico, West Indies, United States

— **CENTRAL** [484].—Costa Rica and the U.S. of Columbia boundary line [484]; Nicaragua Canal [484]; Panama Canal [484]; net expenditure [485]

**St. ANDREW'S Church**, Lambeth, struck by lightning, 58

**ARCH**, Mr. J., his dinner at the National Liberal Club, 8

**ARCHER**, Fred, buried at Newmarket, 53

"**ARETHUSA**" training ship, mutiny on board, 8

**ARGENTINE REPUBLIC** [487].—CELMAN, Dr. J., elected President [487]; cholera [488]; financial position [488]; gold discovery in Patagonia [488]; railway extension [488]

**ARNIM**, Countess Laura von, her body found at Murz, 48

**ARNOLD**, Mr. M., testimonial presented, 53

**ART**, retrospect of, 94

BETHNAL Green Museum, 97

BRITISH Museum, 94

GROSVENOR Gallery, 98

NATIONAL Gallery, 94. National Portrait Gallery, 95

ROYAL Academy of Arts, 97

SALES, 98. Society of British Artists, 98. South Kensington Museum, 95

**ASIA, CENTRAL** [417].—MERV, flood at [417]; railway completed, 38

**AUMALK**, Duc d', expelled from France, 32; his will bequeathing the domain of Chantilly to the Institut de France, 45

**AUSTRALASIAN Federal Council** opened at Hobart, 4

**AUSTRALIA** [490].—COLONIAL defences [492]

**AUSTRALIA, continued**

- HEBRIDES, the New, French occupation [490]; French flag hoisted, 28  
 MAIL and Telegraph systems [498].  
 MELBOURNE, indignation at the treatment of the Colonial wine-growers at the Colonial Exhibition [493]  
 New Caledonia, French convicts [492]  
 WHITE ensign granted for the ships of war [492]  
 — NORTH [504]; railway to Adelaide [504]  
 — SOUTH, financial statement [504]  
 — WESTERN [505]; gold discovery [505], 15  
 AUSTRIA-HUNGARY.—BEUST, Count, death [361]. BUDA-Pesth, 200th anniversary of its delivery from the Turks, 40. BUDGET [361]; debate on, 358  
 CZECHISH language, use of [362]  
 FOREIGN policy [363]  
 JANSKI, Gen., hostile demonstrations against [360]  
 MILITIA, creation of [358]  
 PESTH, Nationalist riots [360], 22  
 PETROLEUM duties [359]  
 VIENNA, Anarchist plot to set fire to the city, 46; Pircher, Joseph, climbed to the top of the golden pinnacle of St. Stephen's Cathedral, 38; Tegethoff, Adm., column unveiled, 43  
 BACON, Vice-Chancellor, resigns his seat on the Bench, 52  
 BAGSHAW, Bishop, of Nottingham, refused absolution to Roman Catholics joining the Primrose League; counter-pastoral from Cardinal Manning, 14  
 BALFOUR, Mr. A., added to the Cabinet, 54; elected Lord Rector of Aberdeen, 55  
 BANK of England, rate of discount reduced, 4, 8, 25; advanced, 20, 49, 59  
 BANQUETING plate, service of, sold by Messrs. Debenham & Storr, 20  
 BARRÈME, M., his body found upon the railway near Maisons Lafitte, 3  
 ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S Church, Smithfield, reopened, 56  
 BASS, Sir M. A., peerage conferred on, 35  
 BASUTOLAND [453].—BRANDY-drinking almost eradicated [453]; Clarke, Sir M., his wise administration [453]; revenue [453]; western border defined [453]  
 BATTENBERG, Princess Henry, birth of a son, 55; infant son christened, 60  
 BECHUANALAND [454].—BOERS, outrages of [454]; Shippard, Mr., his good government [454]; Stellaland claimants [455]; Warren, Sir C., results of his expedition [454]; Wesleyan Missionary Society, charges against the police unfounded [455]  
 BECKET, Sir E., made a peer, 6  
 BELFAST deputation to Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone [11]  
 BELGIUM [383].—BRUSSELS, demonstration of working men in favour of universal suffrage, 37; Chamber of Representatives, Catholic majority [384]  
 CHARLEROI, demonstration of 30,000

**BELGIUM, continued**

- workmen, 51. COMMISSION to inquire into the condition of the labouring classes [384]  
 ELECTIONS, results of, 26  
 HAINAUT, riots in [383]  
 LIÈGE, anniversary of the Commune of Paris celebrated by a Socialist demonstration [383], 12  
 MAIL train robbed between Ostend and Ghent, 55. MILITARY force, system of recruiting [385]. MONS, strikes at, 26  
 RIOTING in, 14  
 STRIKES [383]  
 UNIVERSITIES, new regulations [386]  
 VANDERSMISSEN, M., sentenced to fifteen years', 23; second trial to ten years' penal servitude, 48  
 "BELL'S Life in London" ceased, 22  
 BELLEISLE-EN-MER, revolt among the younger convicts, 6  
 BIDEL, the lion-tamer, narrow escape at Neuilly, 30  
 BILLIARD match between Peall and Collins, 52  
 BIRMINGHAM, rioting at, 8  
 BOARD Schools "remission of fees" came into operation, 46  
 BORNEO, North [507]; trade and revenue [507]  
 BOURBAKI, Gen., accident to his carriage, 2  
 BOYNE, the Battle of the, anniversary celebrated in Ulster, 32  
 BRASKEY, Sir T., peerage conferred, 35  
 BRATIANO, M., the Roumanian Premier, attempt to assassinate, 42  
 BRAY Weir, six persons drowned, 21  
 BRAZIL [487]; result of general election; slaves, emancipation of [487]; finances [487]  
 BRIGANDS, attack on the Castello di Maniace, 12  
 BRIGHT, Mr. J., degree of Honorary D.C.L. conferred, 28  
 BRITISH Association, annual meeting at Birmingham, 40  
 — Fleet, the, ordered to the Piræus, 5  
 BULGARIA [375]. *Vide* Turkey  
 BULLER, Sir Redvers, appointment to the south-west of Ireland [292]  
 BURMAH [419].—ANNEXATION of Upper, 1; British force, advance of [421]; resistance to, 26; Chindwin, garrison established on the [422]; Dacoit movement [419]; depredations [421]; Mandalay, incendiarism and bursting of a large dam [423]; Momeit ruby mines [423]; revenue [423]  
 BURNLEY, new hospital opened by Prince Albert Victor, 47  
 BURNS, centenary of the publication of his poems celebrated at Kilmarnock, 36  
 BUTLER, Dr. H., appointed Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 57  
 CABINET Council, resolution to place the resignation of the Government in the hands of the Queen, 38  
 "CALYPSO," H.M.S., trial cruise, 21  
 CAMBRIDGE University Union, new wing opened by Prince Albert Victor, 3

- CAMPBELL, Lord and Lady, petitions for divorce dismissed, 60
- CANADA [479].—CANADIAN Pacific railway, first through train to Vancouver [480], 29
- IRISH question, motion and amendment [479]
- MONTREAL, revolt in the Vincent St. Paul Penitentiary, 18
- NOVA Scotia Legislature in favour of secession [480]
- PROVINCIAL elections [480]
- CAPE COLONY [451].—BUDGET [452]; Colonial defences [453]; Excise Abolition Bill [452]; the Pondos and Xesibes, differences adjusted [452]
- CARDIFF Savings Bank, defalcations discovered, 18
- CARLTON Club, meeting of the Conservative members, 34
- CARMARVON, Lord, resigns the Viceroyalty of Ireland [9]
- CARNEGIE, Mr. A., his offer of £50,000 for a free library for Edinburgh, 41
- CARROLLTOWN, Mississippi, outrage in the Court-house, 12
- "CARTHAGE," the, passed through the Suez Canal by night with the electric light, 13
- CATTLE disease, "anthrax," in Kent, 53
- CENSUS, religious, throughout the metropolitan district, 49
- CHAMBER of Commerce of the United Kingdom, meeting at Westminster Town Hall, 9
- CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. J., resigns his seat in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet [90, 144], 14; interview with the Sultan, 52
- CHAMPIONSHIP, fight for, prevented by the police, 58; at Paris, 8
- CHANNEL Tunnel, new shaft sunk, 35
- CHEVREUIL, M., centenary celebrated at Paris, 40
- CHILI [489].—BALMACEDA, Don M., President [489]; Messrs. Rothschild's operation for foreign loans [489]; railway development [490]; Santiago, rioting at [489]
- CHINA [435].—ANGLO-CHINESE Convention signed at Peking [440]
- BEKT, M. Paul, Resident-General at Tonquin [435]; death [435]
- COURCY, Gen., recalled [435]
- FRANCE, negotiations with [437]
- HONG KONG, trade with [439]
- LANG, Capt., entrusted with reforms in the navy [439]
- PILGRIMAGE to royal tombs [438]
- POSTAL system [441]
- RAILWAY contracts [441]. REFORM, progress of [441]. Russo-Chinese frontier [441]
- THUONG, death of [436]
- TREATY with France [437, 440]
- VATICAN, negotiations with [440]
- CHOLERA in Argentine Republic [288]; at Barletta, 36; Ferrara district, 28; Fiume and other places on the Dalmatian coast, 29; in Italy, 17; Torre dell' Annunziata, near Naples, 40; Vladivostock, 42
- CHOLMONDELEY, Marquis of, his Norfolk estates offered for sale, 33
- CHURCHILL, Lord Randolph, at Belfast, 9; at Dartford [285], 45; the annual Conference of the National Union of Conservatives at Bradford [287], 49; deputation from the Board of Works, 54; his resignation [303], 60
- CHURCHYARD Bottom Wood, Highgate, result of poll, 57
- CIVIL Service, Treasury Minute to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into, 42
- "CLARENCE," reformatory ship, mutiny, 5
- COBDEN, statue of, unveiled at Stockport, 55
- COLDBATH Fields Prison evacuated and made over to the Clerkenwell Vestry, 14
- COLLINGS, Mr. J., unseated for acts of bribery, 15
- COLONIAL Governments, circular despatch to, 57
- COLSTON banquets at Bristol, 53
- COMORO Islands, protectorate assumed by French Government, 28
- CONGO FREE STATE [459].—BRAZZA, M., Commissary-General [460]; charter for the construction of railways, &c. [459]; Deane, Mr., refusal to surrender a female slave [460]; Dubois, Lieut., drowned [460]; Leopoldville removed to Kinshana [459]; railway from St. Paul de Loanda to Ambaca commenced [460]; West African Conference ratified in Berlin [460]
- COPAIS Lake, near Thebes, canal opened, 25
- COREA, 445.—Port Hamilton, occupation of, by Great Britain [445]; Russian protectorate, rumours of [446]
- CORK, Earl of, resignation, 16
- COURTENAY, Bp. Peter, his coffin discovered at Winchester, 5
- CRANBROOK, Viscount, Secretary of State for War, 4
- CRARAE Granite Quarries, Loch Fyne, deaths from choke-damp, 44
- CRICKET match, Oxford and Cambridge, 30; Eton and Harrow, 31
- CRIMINAL CASES.—ANDREWS, Henry, *alias* Robert King, robbery of the Berlin mail, eight years' penal servitude, 24
- BARTLETT, Mrs. Adelaide, charged with administering a fatal dose of chloroform to her husband, 7; acquitted, 17
- BELT, Mr. R., sentenced to one year's hard labour, 12
- BLOIS, trial for murder at, 54
- BRITLAND, M. A., executed for poisoning Anne Dixon and others, 36
- BROCHARD, Pierre, abstracting money from a monastery at Lille, 35
- CRAWFORD v. Crawford, 7, 33
- HARRIS, Elizabeth, murdering her infant child, 4
- HAUSSMANN, M. A., attempt to murder M. de Montauzun, 5
- MAYER, John, seven years' penal servitude for threatening the Prince of Wales, 3
- PACKER, Alfred, tried for killing and eating his companions, 37
- ROBERTS, David, executed for the murder of David Thomas, 10



**CRIMINAL CASES, continued**

**RUDGE**, Baker and Martin, hanged at Carlisle, 7  
**SHEEHAN**, executed for the murder of his mother, brother, and sister, 4  
**SKYE** Crofters, six, condemned to three months' imprisonment, 59  
**SPRISS** and six other anarchists sentenced to death at Chicago, 38  
**THACKERAY**, G. H., confesses to the murder of John Tower, 1  
**VANDERSMISSEN**, sentenced to ten years' penal servitude, 48  
**WILLIAM** "Viscount Hilton," one year's imprisonment with hard labour, 12  
**CROMELIN**, M., killed in attempting the ascent of the Gross Glockner, 29  
**CUNARD** steamer "Umbria" refused to take the "ship letters," 57  
**CUPAR**, Fife, shower of flies, 36  
**CYCLONES**.—Minnesota, 17; Texas and Louisiana, 47; United States, 21

**DALKEITH**, Earl of, fatal accident while deer-stalking, 42

"**DAVID** Adams" fishing schooner seized by the Canadian authorities, 20

**DEAF** and Dumb Dramatic Club, performance of "Hamlet," 10

**DENMARK** [400].—**BERG**, M., his presidency [401]; release [403]. **BUDGET** [401, 404]

**FARMERS** assisted by loans [405]

**FOLKETHING**, conflict with [400]

**PRESS** prosecutions [403]

**RIGSDAG** re-assembled [404]

**WALDEMAR**, Prince, elected Prince of Bulgaria, declined by the King, 52

**DEVONSHIRE** House, meeting at [180]

**DHULEEP** Singh, permitted to reside only in the Madras Presidency, 18

**DILKE**, Sir C., address at Chelsea, 19; farewell address to electors, 33

**DILLON**, Mr., arrested, 59; gave bail for his good behaviour, 61

**DIVORCES**, number of, in the French capital, 26

**DOGS**, police regulations, 50

**DRAMA**, retrospect of, 98.—**ENGLISH** productions, 98; French plays, 102; Musical Comedy, 101; Opéra bouffe, 101; revivals of old works, 100

**DROUGHT**, Dr., banished from France, 39

**DUELS**.—Prince Amédée de Broglie and the Vicomte de Tretern, 12; Gen. Boulanger and Baron de Lareintay, 32

**DUFFERIN**, Lord, visits Pondicherry, 58

**EARTHQUAKES**.—Alsace, 48; Athens, 41; Carolina, North and South, 43, 49; Charleston, 40, 42, 43; Cornwall, 4; Devonshire, South, 1; Georgia, 43; Granada, 12; Ohio, 49; Peloponnesus, 39, 40; Shetland Isles, 46; Smyrna, 39, 58; Strasburg, 48; Tennessee, 49; United States, 39; Virginia, 49; the Vosges, 48; Wiesbaden, 12

**ECCLESIASTICAL**.—**CHURCH CONGRESS** at Wakefield, 46

**DOWDEN**, Rev. Dr., Bp. of Edinburgh, 36

**ECCLESIASTICAL, continued**

**GOE**, Rev. F. F., Bp. of Melbourne, 41

**GOTT**, Rev. J., Dean of Worcester, 3

**KNOX**, the most Rev. R., first Primate of the Disestablished Church of Ireland, 23

**LIDDON**, Canon, declined the Bishopric of Edinburgh, 23

**MOORHOUSE**, Dr., Bishop of Manchester, [500], 3

"**EDINBURGH** Courant," the, appeared for the last time, 6

**EDINBURGH** Philosophical Society, inaugural address, 53

**EDWARD** the Confessor's shrine at Westminster, Roman Catholic pilgrimages, 48

**EGYPT** [446].—**ARABS**, engagements with [446]. **ASSOUAN**, heat at [447]

**BUDGET**, 450

**CORVÉE**, partial abolition of [450];

**COUNTERFEIT** coin introduced [449]

**DAIRA** scandals [449]; commission of inquiry, 29

**MASSOWAH**, German colony at [450]

**OSMAN** Digna [447]

**TURKEY**, negotiations with [448]

**WADY** Halfa, withdrawal of troops to [447]. **WARREN**, Sir C., at Souakim [447]

**EISTEDDFOD**, the Welsh, at Carnarvon, the Lord Mayor of London received as a "Bard," 42

**ELECTION**, the General, commenced, 28; closed, 34

**ELECTIONS**, municipal, results of, 51

**ELEMENTARY** Education Acts of England and Wales, Royal Commission to inquire into, 3

**EXHIBITION**, the Colonial and Indian, opened by the Queen, 19; receipts and expenditure, 52

— Fisheries, receipts and expenditure, 52

— Health, receipts and expenditure, 52

— International, at Edinburgh, opened by Prince Albert Victor, 20

— — at Liverpool, opened by the Queen, 20

**FIELD**, Mr. Cyrus, damages for libel, 33

**FIJI** Islands, the, visited with a terrible hurricane, 10

**FIRES**.—**AIX-LA-CHAPELLE**, spinning mill, 2

**ALBERT** Palace, Battersea, 46

**ASTLEY** Castle, Warwickshire, 2

**BATTERSEA**, 56

**BEAK** Street, 19

**BEKSTON**, Nottingham, 19

**BERYSTED** House, Ascot, 50

**BIARRITZ**, Casino, 48

**BRIGHTON** Barracks, 18

**BRIGITTENAU**, Galicia, 19

**BRUSSELS** University, 30

**CHELMSFORD** Workhouse, 57

**CITY** Road, Eagle Wharf, 13

**COVENT** Garden Market, 9

**DAMASCUS**, British Consulate, 15

**DERBY**, Grand Theatre, 20

**DETROIT**, Michigan, 1

**DIDCOT** Junction station, 11

**DUFFRYN** Hall, 5

**FIRES, continued**

**EASTPORT**, Maine, 48  
**EXETER**, 22  
**FRIEDLAND**, Moravia, 18  
**FRIMSTEIN**, Canton Berne, 53  
**GLASGOW**, Blind Asylum, 57  
**HACKNEY**, Frampton House, 20  
**HAMPTON** Court Palace, 54  
**ISLE of Dogs**, Dudgeon's Wharf, 38  
**JACKSON**, Michigan, Poor-house, 4  
**KILLARNEY** House, 47  
**KING's Cross**, 49  
**KNIGHTRIDER** Street, Doctors' Commons, 56  
**LIVERPOOL**, Lewis's Menagerie, 60 ; telephone head office, 16  
**MADRAS**, 61  
**MAKOW**, Poland, 58  
**MANDALAY**, 19  
**OELS**, Silesia, 10  
**OXFORD**, Clergy House, 45 ; Queen's College, 58  
**PARIS**, Belleville quarter, 4  
**PRIGUEUX**, Grand Séminaire, 49  
**PHILADELPHIA**, cotton mills, 2 ; Temple Theatre, 61  
**RADNA**, Hungary, 41  
**RAMSGATE**, Cliff Street, 51  
**RICHMOND**, public baths, 52  
**SALISBURY**, Trafalgar House, 18  
 — Maryland, 48  
**SALTLEY**, gas works, 53  
**SCHEVENING**, the Hague, 40  
**SHOREDITCH**, "Jacob's Well," 20  
**SILLEIN**, Hungary, 37  
**SKIEN**, Telemarka, 37  
**SKINNER** Street, Finsbury, 84  
**STRY**, Galicia, 17  
**SUTTON**, Surrey, 59  
**TEMPLE** House, Great Marlow, 46  
**TOOLEY** Street, 18  
**TORONTO**, mail premises, 22  
**VANCOUVER**, British Columbia, 25, 32  
**WHITEHALL** Gardens, Board of Trade, 16  
**FISHERMEN**, fight between the English and French at Ramsgate, 46  
**FISHING** smacks, English, detained at Havre, 41  
**FLOODS**.—**ABERYSTWICH**, 48 ; Bohemia, 27 ; Boston, 7 ; Bouches-du-Rhône, 50 ; Montreal, 17 ; Saxony, 22 ; Silesia, 27 ; Thuringia, 22, 27 ; Tregaron, Cardiganshire, 41 ; United States, 15 ; Vaucuse, 50  
**FOG** of great denseness over London, 55  
**FOREIGN** Office, meeting at the [194]  
**FORSTER**, Rt. Hon. W. E., death [93] ; funeral service in Westminster Abbey, 16  
**FOX-HUNTING** abandoned in Limerick, 1  
**FRANCE** [316].—**BERT**, Paul, at Tonquin [321] ; death [331]. Boulianger, Gen., his popularity [324]. Budget [329, 332]  
 "CABINET Noir" abolished, 48. Château-Villain. disturbances at [325]. Colonial affairs [318]. Crown diamonds, alienation of [322]  
**DECAZEVILLE**, strike at [320], 25. Royalist Demonstration, 29  
**FREYCINET**, M. de, resignation [333], 57  
**GAMBETTA**, weight of his brain after death, 16. *Général-sécrétariat* [322].

**FRANCE, continued**

Goblet, M., constructs a new administration, 58  
**LYONS**, Vicomte O. R. de Coligny appointed station-master, 59  
**ORLEANS** Princes, expulsion of [326]  
**PARIS**, Bourse, outrage at, 10. Floquet, Pres., shot at, 31. French Academy elections, 7. Grande Roquette prison, mutiny of prisoners, 19. Guibert, Card., funeral of, 32. International Trades Union Congress, 39. Marseilles, disturbances at, 32. Metropolitan Railway [325]. Municipal Council [325]. National Fêtes of the French Republic, 32. Primary Instruction, law of [323]. Princes' Expulsion Bill passed, 27. Provincial Councils [327]. Vote of Credit [335]  
**FRUIT**, fresh, from South Australia and New South Wales, 22  
**GALE** across England, 3 ; over the United Kingdom, 58  
**GARRETT**, R. T., the Texas desperado, hanged, 7  
**GERMANY** [343].—**AFRICA**, West Coast of, line of boundary [355]. **ALSACE-Lorraine**, municipal elections [352]. **ARMY** Bill, debate on [357]  
**BAVARIA**, King of, official report of the state of his health, 47 ; suicide [349], 25 ; funeral, 26 ; Leopold, Prince, appointed Regent [349] ; proclamation on assembling the Regency, 25. **BERLIN**, Albedyll, Count, house plundered by burglars, 6 ; Emperor William's silver jubilee celebrated, 1 ; ninetieth birthday celebrated, 13 ; Frederick William IV., monument unveiled, 25 ; Radziwill, Prince A., palace entered by burglars, 6 ; Reichstag, Royal Speech at opening, 55 ; committee on the Army Bill, 59. **BISMARCK**, Prince, and the Poles [343] ; on the May Laws [352] ; his Spirit Monopoly Bill rejected, 14. **BULGARIA**, policy towards [357]  
**COLONIAL** Affairs [353]  
**FREDERICK** the Great, centenary celebrated at Potsdam, 38  
**LEIPZIG**, encounters between police and Socialists, 44  
**MAY** Laws, the [351]  
**POLKS**, the Prussian [343] ; **POLITICO-ecclesiastical** Laws Bill [350].  
**SEPTENNATE**, the Military, antedated by one year [356]. **SOCIALISM** [348]. **SPIRIT** Monopoly Bill [347], 14.  
**STRASBURG**, military parade held by the Emperor, 41  
**WESTERN** Pacific, line of demarcation [354]. "WHITE Book," the [354]  
**GILLOTT**, Mr. J., fatally stabbed at Sheffield, 17  
**GIRLING**, Mrs., the "mother" of the Shaker community in New Forest, buried at Lymington, 43  
**GLADSTONE**, Mr., his pamphlet on the Irish Question [272], 39 ; deputations from Ireland [289] ; the freedom of the boroughs of Cork, Limerick, Waterford, and Clonmel conferred on him, 45

GOLD, discovery of, in Western Australia, 15, 22; in the Transvaal, Tasmania, and Queensland [458], 43  
 GORDON, Gen., expenditure incurred for his relief, 14  
 "GORSEDD," or meeting of Welsh Druids, in the Temple Gardens, 53  
 GOSCHEN, Mr., upon Hearing, Reading, and Thinking, 9  
 GOSS, Sir J., memorial unveiled in the crypt of St. Paul's Cathedral, 20  
 GOSSET, P., treasurer of the Jersey States, five years' penal servitude, 20  
 GOVERNMENT defeated on Mr. J. Collings' amendment, 5  
 GRAVEL Pit Wood, the, dedicated to the public use, 50  
 "GREAT Eastern," the, narrow escape at Holyhead Harbour, 47  
 GREEK coast, blockade raised, 24  
 GUELPH, Caroline, claiming to be a daughter of George IV., applied for outdoor relief at Camberwell, 48  
 GUINNESS, Messrs., purchase of their business announced by Messrs. Baring, 49  
 GUY's Hospital, meeting at the Mansion House in aid of the funds, 60  
  
 HAMILTON, Sir R. G. C., Governor of Tasmania, 54  
 — Alderman of Poole, shot by King, 22  
 — Mr. J. C., peerage conferred, 35  
 HANSON, Sir R., Lord Mayor of London, 44  
 HARTINGTON, Lord, declined to take part in a Coalition Ministry, 61  
 HARVARD University, 250th anniversary, 52  
 HEAT, extraordinary, throughout England, 46  
 HEIDELBERG University, quinqucentenary fêtes of, 34  
 HENDERSON, Sir E. Y., resigned his post as Chief Commissioner to the Metropolitan Police, 8  
 HENEAGE, Mr., resigned office, 16  
 HENNESSY, Sir J. P., suspended, 59  
 HOBART Pasha, funeral, 33  
 HOLLOWAY College for Women, the Royal, opened by the Queen, 28  
 HOLMES, Mr. Wendell, degree of Honorary D.C.L. conferred, 28  
 HOME Rule Bill, second reading, 24  
 HORNBY, Adm., received the Grand Cross of the Bath, 11  
 HOUSE of Commons closed in consequence of defective sanitary arrangements, 22  
 — of Laymen, the, first meeting, 8  
 HUNTER, John, statue unveiled by the Princess Christian, 23  
 HURRICANES.—Fiji Islands, 10; Krossen in Brandenburg, 21; Lonato, near Brescia, 21; Madrid, 21; St. Vincent, Island of, 38  
 HYNDMAN, Burns, Champion, and Williams at Bow Street Court, 8; apply for an order against the printer and publisher of *Punch*, 9; acquitted of the charge of sedition, 16

IDDESLEIGH, Earl of, Lord Lieutenant of the County of Devon, 2; entertained at

IDDESLEIGH, Earl of, *continued*  
 a banquet at Willis's Rooms, presented with a testimonial, 11; elected Lord Rector of Edinburgh, 51  
 INDIA [424].—ARMY [425]  
 BUDGET, [430]  
 DHULEEP Singh's claims [435]. DUFFERIN, Lord, cordial reception in India [435]  
 ESTIMATES [431]  
 FINANCIAL affairs [428]  
 GODAVERY, inundation at, 45  
 HOLKAR, death of [424]. HYDRABAD, riots between Sikhs and Muhammadans [425]  
 LAND-JOBING in the Nilgiri Hills [433]. LEGISLATION [426]  
 MARRIAGES, early [434]  
 NIPAL, state of affairs [425]  
 PETROLEUM found near Sibi [428]. PUBLIC Works [427]  
 RELIGIOUS disturbances [432]  
 SINDIA, death of [424]  
 INSTITUTE, Indian and Colonial, the Prince of Wales' scheme of, 51  
 IRELAND.—ANTI-RENT meetings proclaimed in Sligo, 55. Armagh and Tyrone proclaimed under the Peace Preservation Act, 26  
 BELFAST, riots in [308], 23, 24, 32, 35, 36, 37, 43, 45; Royal Commission to inquire into, 46; nine policemen arrested on charge of wilful murder, 38  
 "CAPTAIN Moonlight" arrested, 47.  
 Carnarvon, Lord, his retirement [305].  
 Castle Island, five moonlighters arrested, 44. Cork, demonstration in honour of Mr. T. Hurley, 56  
 DILLON, Mr., judgment pronounced against, 59. Dublin, election riots, 29; Londonderry, the Marquis, his state entry, 42; Scots Guards attacked by the mob, 23; Sheriffs, private meetings to select, 56  
 GALWAY election [308]; riot at, 42  
 HOME Rule Bill, disturbances on its rejection, 24  
 KING's County, the bailiffs and process servers refuse to serve writs, 60  
 LADIES, two young, shot at by moonlighters, 46; Loughrea, O'Brien, Harris, and Sheehy arrested, 59.  
 Lurgan, rioting at, 24, 57  
 PLAN of Campaign [310], 60  
 SLIGO, riots in, 25; meeting broken up by police, 56. Sullivan, Mr. T. D., appointed Lord Mayor of Dublin, 1  
 TENANTS' Relief Bill, defeat of [310].  
 Tornagull, marriage forbidden by moonlighters, 10  
 VANDELEUR, Mr., fired at four times, 48.  
 Voters, number of illiterate, 20  
 IRISH National Convention at Chicago, 38  
 — Nationalists, public meeting at St. James's Hall, 27  
 IRVING, Mr. H., lecture on the English drama at Oxford, 28  
 ITALIAN Opera, the, closed with a strike of the employés, 11  
 ITALY [335].—AUTUMN Session [341]  
 BUDGET [342]; committee [336, 339]  
 CABINET, dissolution [337]

*continued*

r, the General [338]  
 rist manifestation [389]  
 [336]. LOMBARDY, rioting  
 ]  
 disturbances at, 15  
 postolic Delegate to, renounced  
 PORRO, Count, massacre of his  
 [38]  
 n. La Marmora's bust unveiled,

[42].—CONSTITUTION, the new  
 costume, native, change of  
 foreigners, protection of [443];  
 influence [445]; journalism  
 Mikado, the, sent the Prince of  
 the Grand Cross of the Imperial  
 of the Chrysanthemum [444];  
 444]  
 ss of, her orders for court and  
 resses from Paris, 48  
 nking Company stopped pay-  
 2; the "States" declare their  
 er bankrupt, 3  
 , Protestant bishopric of, treaty  
 annulled, 61  
 in, frozen to death, 11

Gen., recalled from Roumania,

, the Very Rev. James, killed  
 altar by the fall of a stone orna-  
 6

Mr. A., appointed Vice-  
 llor, 53  
 Earl of, resignation, 16

severe snowstorm, 33  
 , statue unveiled at Passy, 30  
 between Chester and Crewe, 2  
 s championship match at Wim-  
 32

rioting at, 7  
 s, shots fired at her carriage, 16  
 Ir. J., bicycle run from the  
 End, 26  
 nionists, meeting at Devonshire  
 [180], 36; conference at Willis's  
 [298], 57  
 Bartholdi's colossal statue in-  
 ed at New York, 50  
 é, visited England, 15; death,

JRE, retrospect of, 62. WORKS  
 SEASON, principal:—

Mr. C., "The English Church  
 Bishops, 1700-1800," 78. Allen,  
 , "Eminent Women Series," 67.  
 Mr. E., "India Revisited," 86.  
 Mr. F., "Robertson of Brigh-

ton Library, the," 88. Baird,  
 The Huguenots and Henry of  
 ,," 65. Baring-Gould, "Ger-  
 88. Barker and Daughlish,  
 , "The Historical and Political  
 ok," 82. Barlow, Mr., "The  
 is in South Europe," 66.  
 Mr. J., "John Bunyan," 78  
 Hon. A. S., "Revolted Ire-

LITERATURE, *continued*

land," 81. Carlisle, Mr., "Correspond-  
 ence of Abraham Hayward," 77. Chan-  
 cellor, Mr. B., "The Life of Charles I.,"  
 64. Cosson, Major de, "Days and  
 Nights of Service with Sir Gerald  
 Graham's Field Force at Suakin," 69.  
 Cunningham, Mr., "The Hulsean Lec-  
 tures, 1885," 79

DAUNT, O'Neill, "Eighty-five Years of  
 Irish History," 81. Dicey, Mr., "Eng-  
 land's Case against Home Rule," 82.  
 "Doyle, Sir Francis, the Reminiscences  
 and Opinions of," 77. Doyle, Mr.,  
 "The English in America," 86. Duffy,  
 Sir C. G., "The League of North and  
 South," 81

EDWARDES, Lady, "Memorials of the  
 Life and Letters of Maj.-Gen. Sir H.  
 Edwardes," 70

FARRAR, Archdeacon, "History of In-  
 terpretation," 79. Ferrier, Prof.,  
 "Functions of the Brain," 98. Froude,  
 Mr., "Oceana," 84. Fyffe, Mr.,  
 "History of Modern Europe," 68

GARDINER, Prof., "History of the Great  
 Civil War," 65. Geary, Mr., "Burma  
 after the Conquest, viewed in its Poli-  
 tical, Social, and Commercial Aspects  
 from Mandalay," 86. Gordon, Sir H.,  
 "Events in the Life of Charles George  
 Gordon," 68. Gordon-Cumming, Miss,  
 "Wanderings in China," 87. "Grant,  
 U. S., Personal Memoirs of," 71. Grego,  
 Mr., "A History of Parliamentary  
 Elections in the Old Days," 82.  
 Greely, Major, "Three Years of Arctic  
 Service," 88. Grimley, Mr., "The  
 Temple of Humanity," 79

HATTON, Mr. F., "North Borneo," 86.  
 Hobart Pasha, "Sketches from my  
 Life," 71. Hodder, Mr., "Life and  
 Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftes-  
 bury," 73. Hore, Mr., "The Church  
 in England from William III. to Vic-  
 toria," 79. Hübner, Baron von,  
 "Through the British Empire," 85

IBRAHIM-HILMY, Prince, "Bibliography  
 of Egypt and the Soudan," 70

LANE-POOLE, Mr. S., "The Art of the  
 Saracens in Egypt," 92. Lang, Mr.,  
 "English Worthies," 66. Lang, An-  
 drew, "Letters to Dead Authors," 92.  
 Laurie, Prof., "The Rise and Constitu-  
 tion of Universities," 83. Lee, Vernon,  
 "Baldwin," 80. Lilly, Mr., "Chapters  
 in European History," 62. Loftie, Mr.,  
 "Historic Towns," 83. Longfellow,  
 Mr. S., "Life of Henry Wadsworth  
 Longfellow," 75. Lysaght, S. R., "A  
 Modern Ideal," 90

MARSHALL, Prof. M., "Practical Zoo-  
 logy," 93. Maudsley, H., "Ancient  
 Rome in 1885," 92. Minchin, Mr.,  
 "Growth of Freedom in the Balkan  
 Peninsula," 83. Montagu-Burrows,  
 "The Family of Brocas of Beaure-  
 paire," 66. Morris, Mr. Lewis, "Gy-  
 cia," 90. Morse, Mr., "American  
 Statesmen," 72

NESBIT, E., "Lays and Legends," 90.  
 Norton, Mr., "Early Letters of Thomas  
 Carlyle," 76

**LITERATURE, continued**

- O'CONNOR, Mr. T. P., "The Parnell Movement," 80; "Gladstone's House of Commons," 81. O'Meara, Miss, "Madame Mohl and her Friends," 68
- PATMORE, Coventry, "Poems," 90.
- Pears, Mr., "The Fall of Constantinople," 66. Prideaux, Mrs., "Philip Molesworth," 91
- RICE, Mr., "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln," 72. Roberta, Mr. P., "Liberalism in Religion," 79. Royle, Mr., "The Egyptian Campaign," 69
- SALMON, Mr., "Crown Colonies of Great Britain," 85. Scott, Mr., "Burma as it Was, as it Is, and as it Will Be," 86. Stephen, Mr. L., "Dictionary of National Biography," 64. Stepniak, "The Russian Storm-cloud," 84. Stevenson, Father, "Mary Stuart," 63. Swinburne, Mr., "Study of Victor Hugo," 74; "Miscellanies," 91. Symonds, Mr., "The Catholic Reaction," 63. Symonds, Mr. A. T., "Sir Philip Sidney," 65
- TENNYSON, "Locksley Hall Sixty Years after," 89. Thomas, Mr. J., "Cannibals and Convicts," 83. Trotter, Capt., "India under Victoria," 87. Tucker, Mr., "Life and Society in Eastern Europe," 84
- WALFORD, Major, "The Parliamentary Generals," 71. Walpole, Spencer, "History of England from the conclusion of the Great War in 1815," 62. Williams, Mr., "English Letters and Letter-writers of the Eighteenth Century," 91. Wollaston, Mr., "Half-hours with Muhammad," 91. Woltmann, Dr., "History of Painting," 93
- LIVERPOOL Maritime Exhibition closed, 52
- LLANDULAS, English workmen protected, 1
- LOMOND, Loch, frozen over, 7
- LONDON riots [45]
- Trades' Council and Working Men's Association, deputation to the Prince of Wales, 53
- LONSDALE, Earl of, fined 40s. for assaulting Mr. D. de Bensaud, 35
- LORD Mayor, the, deputation from the various trade organisations, 6; his procession, 52
- and Lady Mayoress entertain the representatives of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition at the Mansion House, 27
- and Sheriffs opened the new Art Gallery at Guildhall, 27
- LORD Mayor's Day, precautions to prevent a Socialist meeting [293]
- LOWE, Mr. J. G., murdered in a railway carriage, 41
- LOWESTOFT fishermen's nets damaged by Belgian sailors, 53
- LUCAS, Mr. S., associate of the Royal Academy, 5
- MADAGASCAR [463].—FRANCE, treaty with [463]
- MAIL, the American, exclusive contract refused to the White Star and Cunard

**MAIL, continued**

- lines, 55; the English, from London to Berlin, robbed, 16
- MANCHESTER, demonstrations of the "Unemployed," 12
- Ship Canal, Messrs. Lucas & Aird's offer, 26; Messrs. Rothschild's proposal of shares, 33
- MANSFIELD College, Oxford, inaugurated, 48
- MARAT, the bath in which he was stabbed sold at Vannes, 34
- ST. MARYLEBONE Parish Church, attempted burglary, 35
- MASS meeting of the "Unemployed" in Trafalgar Square [45], 6; further assemblages, 7. Of the Social Democratic Federation in Hyde Park, 8; in Trafalgar Square [45], [293]. 54
- MAURITIUS, 464. HENNESSY, Sir J. P., differences with Mr. Clifford Lloyd [464]; suspended [465]. Lloyd, Mr. C., temporary appointment to the Seychelles Island, [465]
- MAY-day celebrated at Chelsea and Knutsford, 19
- MAYER's frauds in Patti's name [483]
- MEDICAL Examination Hall, foundation stone laid by Queen Victoria, 13
- MEETING at Her Majesty's Theatre to denounce the legislative separation of Ireland from England, 17
- MERLATTI completed his fast, 59
- MERSEY Tunnel opened by the Prince of Wales, 4
- METROPOLITAN Board of Works, financial statement for the ensuing year, 13; Budget, 60
- MEXICO [480].—BRITISH Convention Debt [482]
- CRAWFORD, Capt., death [480]. CUTTING arrested and released [481]
- DOMESTIC events [483]. DRAINAGE [482]
- FINANCE [481]. FOREIGN relations [481]
- GOVERNMENT lands [482]
- MAYER, his frauds in Patti's name [483]
- POLITICS, internal [481]
- SOCIAL entertainments [483]
- MILFORD Haven, naval manoeuvres at, 37
- MILLS, Sir C., made a peer, 6
- MINERS' Conference at Manchester, 55
- MINGRELIA, Prince of, candidate for the throne of Bulgaria, 53
- MONTAUZUN, M. G. de, attempt to murder him by M. A. Haussmann, 5
- MORLEY, the Earl of, resigned office, 16
- MORMON Elders and Missionaries, meeting at St. George's Hall, 47
- MOUAT, Elizabeth, blown across the sea from Shetland to Norway, 8
- MOZAMBIQUE [462]. Inhambane, revolt in [462]
- MUSIC, retrospect of, 102.—ALBERT Hall Choir, 105
- BACH Choir, 105
- CHAMBER Concerts, 106. CRYSTAL Palace, 104
- LEEDS Festival, 106. LONDON Symphony Concerts, 105
- MONDAY Popular Concerts, 106
- NOVELLO's Oratorio Concerts, 105
- OPERA, English, 103; Italian, 102; French grand, 104



**MUSIC, continued**

**PHILHARMONIC**, 104

**RICHTER** Concerts, 104. **RUBINSTEIN's** piano recitals, 106

**SATURDAY** Popular Concerts, 106

**THREE** Choirs Festival, 107

**WOLVERHAMPTON** Triennial Festival, 107

**MYCENÆ** Acropolis, discoveries in, 42

**NAPIER**, Lord, of Magdala, appointed Constable of the Tower, 60

**NAPOLEON**, Prince, and his son left Paris, 27

**NATIONAL** Liberal Association, the [191]

— Federation, manifesto [258]; conference of [290]; Mr. Morley at [291]; ninth annual at Leeds, 51

— Rifle Association, meeting at Wimbledon, 33

— Society of Professional Musicians, first annual conference, 2

**NETHERLANDS**.—**AMSTERDAM**, Socialist manifestation [386]; rioting at, 33; Ministerial crisis [387]

**COLONIAL** difficulties [388]

**DELFT**, Grotius' statue unveiled, 44

**HAGUE**, Socialist meeting, 24

**HEEMSKIRK** Ministry [387]

**UTRECHT** University, 250th anniversary, 27

**NEW GUINEA** [502]. Administration, proposals for [503]

**NEW SOUTH WALES** [493].—**APPROPRIATION** Bill passed [496]; centenary, proposals for its celebration [496]; estimates [496]; financial proposals [498]; income-tax reduced [495]; military force, reductions in [497]; ministers' re-election [498]; Robertson, Sir J., grant of 10,000*l.* on his retirement [494]; Solomons, Mr., the Chief-justiceship offered to him [496]; Wisdom, Mr., defiance of the Speaker, removed from the House [494]

**NEW YORK**, Coney Island, attempt to blow up a steamer, 34; contest for the Mayoralty, 51; George, Mr. H., chosen mayor [478]; Jachne, Alderman, sentenced to nine years and ten months' imprisonment, 21; Most, Herr, sentenced to one year's imprisonment, 22; Stock Exchange, panic in, 59

**NEW ZEALAND** [506]; Financial condition [506]; Hawera, disturbances near [507]; Kermadec Island annexed to Great Britain [507]; population [506]; Rotorua, volcano at [506]

**NIAGARA** Rapids passed by Graham in a barrel, 32; by two coopers, 36; by Kendall, 39

— Suspension Bridge, L. M. Donovan leaped from, 52

**NORWAY** [405].—**BJÖRNSTJERNE** Bjornson, Mr., reception at Christiania [410]. **BUDGET** [410]

**CHRISTIANIA** Workmen's College, grant to [410]

**FAILURES** at Arendal and other towns [410]

**NORWAY, continued**

**KIELLAND**, Mr. A., granted a "poet's stipend" [407]

**STORTHING**, the, opened by the King [406]. **SWEDEN**, relations with [407]

**NOVA** Scotia, result of elections, 26; in favour of secession from Canada [480]

**OBITUARY**.—**ADAMS**, C. F., 163; Aigners, J., 180; Ailesbury, Marquess of, 159; Aksakoff, T. S., 180; Amherst, Earl, 184; Amos, Prof. S., 125; Anderson, Sir J., 150; Anderson, Sir S. L., 175; Andrews, S. P., 147; Anstruther, Sir R., 150; Anthony, Mark, 175; Archer, F. J., 165; Arnould, J., 180; Arthur, Pres. C. A., 161; Arthur, Rear-Admiral W., 169; Aspinall, J. B., 129; Atkinson, Capt. R. F., 151; Atkinson, J. B., 159; Ayrton, Rt. Hon. A. S., 168

**BAKER**, T. B. L., 175; Barham, Rev. R. D., 138; Barnes, Rev. W., 159; Barrington, Viscount, 165; Barrow, Col. P. H. S., 125; Baudry, Paul, 126; Bellamy-Gordon, Hon. Mrs., 142; Bellegarde, Lieut.-Field-Marshal Count A. von, 125; Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., 150; Bentinck, G. W. P., 180; Bert, Paul, 160; Beust, Count, 157; Beust, Countess, 176; Bewick, Rev. Dr., 160; Bickford, Vice-Admiral J. G., 154; Birch, Ven. Archdeacon E., 152; Boileau, Maj.-Gen. J. T., 169; Borghese, Prince M. A., 159; Bourbon, Prince Louis de, 147; Boyle, Hon. and Rev. R. C. T., 184; Bradshaw, H., 180; Bramley-Moore, J., 167; Brooke, F. C., 125; Brougham and Vaux, Lord, 125; Bucknall-Estcourt, Caroline, Lady, 169; Burrell, Sir W. W., 126; Burstal, Capt. E., 149; Busk, George, 152; Butler, Dr. G., 129; Butler, Rev. T., 176

**CALDECOTT**, Randolph, 127; Capell-Brooke, Sir W. de, 183; Cardwell, Viscount, 128; Castries, Duc de, 137; Chambord, Comtesse, de, 131; Chernside, Maj.-Gen. H. L., 124; Chichester, Earl of, 181; Childers, Maj. F. C. E., 142; Cholmondeley, Dow. Marchioness of, 129; Churchill, Baron F. G. S., 170; Churchill, H. A., 149; Chute, Gen. Sir T., 138; Cloëté, Gen. Sir A. J., 159; Clowes, George, 169; Cockrell, A., 147; Collin, E., 137; Collings, Gen. J. E., 175; Colville, C. R., 133; Conaty, Rev. Dr., 126; Cook, Paul, 141; Coope, O. E., 170; Cooper, W. W., 147; Cornaro, Lieut.-Field-Marshal Baron L., 137; Cotterill, Rt. Rev. Dr., 137; Cowie, H., 150; Cradock, E. H., 126; Crampton, Sir J. F. T., 175; Crommellin, Lieut.-Gen. W. A., 160; Croskery, Rev. T., 159; Custance, Gen. W. N., 180; Czajkowski, M., 126

**DACRES**, Sir R., 170; Dalkeith, Earl of, 154; Dalyell, Sir R. A. O., 126; Danby, T., 134; Daubigny, Karl, 142; Decazes, the Duc, 153; Delany, Most Rev. Dr., 169; Denny, Col. W., 159; Dobba,

OBITUARY, *continued*

C. R., 131; Doo, G. T., 169; Druser Leo, 152; Duncke, Prof. M. W., 150; Dundas, Lady M. M., 129; Dundas, Maj.-Gen. J. D., 154; Dupplin, Viscount, 133; Dury-Geden, Rev. J., 133  
**EBERSBERG**, O. F., 126; Eden, Bp., 152; Edwards, Lieut.-Col. Sir H., 137; Edwards, T., 138; Elphinstone, Sir J. D. H., 176; Enniskillen, Earl of, 167; Errington, Archbp., 126  
**FALKLAND**, Viscount, 129; Falloux, M. de, 125; Farnborough, Lord, 139; Fellowes, Vice-Adm. C., 133; Ferguson, Sir S., 152; Fergusson, James, 125; Festing, Maj.-Gen. Sir F. W., 170; Ffoulkes, Ven. H. P., 126; Filmer, Sir E., 176; Fitzgerald, Lord G., 154; Forester, Rt. Hon. G. C. W., 130; Forster, Rt. Hon. W. E., 134; Forsyth, Sir D., 173; Francis, F., 176; Franzelin, Card. G. B., 176; Fraser, Lieut.-Col. the Hon. J. H., 134; Frère, Edouard, 142  
**GELDERN**, Baron G. H., 169; Gibbs, James, 160; Gibson, J. J., 159; Gibson-Craig, J. T., 149; Giraud, R. H., 159; Girling, Mrs., 154; Goddard, G. B., 133; Gordon, Dr. A., 151; Gordon-Lennox, Lord F. C., 124; Gottschalk, W., 150; Gough, J. B., 130; Grant, Gen. Sir J. T., 125; Grant, Miss C., 131; Green, Lieut.-Gen. H. H., 134; Greene, Col. G., 176; Grosvenor, Hon. G., 159; Grote, Arthur, 175; Gruzinsky, Prince G. O., 133; Guibert, Mgr., 149; Guthrie, F., 159  
**HACK**, D. R., 133; Hancock, Maj.-Gen., 127; Hanson, A., 125; Harding, Lieut.-Col. W., 125; Harpur-Crewe, Sir J., 133; Hartley, J., 141; Hatton, J. L., 154; Haviland-Burke, E., 147; Haviland, J. von S. de, 154; Haworth-Leslie, Capt. M. E., 169; Hawtrey, Rev. S., 160; Henrick, Lieut., 154; Hetzel, Jules, 134; Hill, Maj.-Gen. Sir W., 152; Hoare, J., 126; Hobart Pasha, 145; Holkar, Maharajah, 143; Houston-Boswall, Sir G., 125; Hughes, Gen. T. E., 141; Hulsén, Herr von, 155; Humble, Sir J. N., 147; Humphrey, Rev. W. G., 125; Huyshe, Maj.-Gen. A. G., 151  
**IMBRIANI**, Vittorio, 125; Isabey, E., 138  
**JACKSON**, Rev. T., 134; Janin, Jules, 130; Jewitt, L., 147; Johnson, G. W., 160; Judson, E. Z. C., 152  
**KALISCH**, Dr. I., 141; Kay, Rev. W., 126; Kelk, Sir J., 154; Kellner, Sir G. W., 147; Kendall, Capt. J. J., 133; Kennedy, J., 155; Kerr, Adm. R., 160; Kerrison, Sir E. C., 149; King-Hall, Adm. Sir W., 150; Kompert, L., 170; Krapotkin, A., 151  
**LACHAT**, E., 159; Lacy, Gen. R. W., 155; Lalaune, M., 152; Latham, G. W., 159; Latour, M. de L., 154; Law, Hon. W. T., 160; Leake, Sir L. S., 141; Lennox, Lord H. G., 151; Lentaigne, Sir J. F., 169; Leopold, Prince, of Anhalt, 129; Lippincott, J. B., 125; Liszt, Franz, 147; Loewe, L., 154; Logan, Senator J. A., 174; Low, Samp-

OBITUARY, *continued*

son, 137; Ludwig, King of Bavaria, 142  
**MAAS**, J., 125; Macdougall, Bp. F. T., 169; Macpherson, Col. D., 159; Macpherson, Sir H., 155; Madden, R. R., 129; Madvig, J. N., 172; Malet, Sir A. C., 170; Mann, R. J., 151; Martin, Sir J., 165; Mason, H., 129; Massy-Beresford, Very Rev. J. M., 159; Matheson, Sir A., 150; Maude, Capt. the Hon. F., 159; Maxwell, Sir W., 147; Mayer, J., 126; Melville, Viscount, 130; Mercer, Lt.-Col. E. S., 151; Michel, Field-Marshal the Rt. Hon. Sir J., 141; Miles, J., 141; Miller, E., 125; Milton, Viscountess, 134; Minghetti, M., 171; M'Laren, D., 138; Moeve, Dr. W., 169; Molteno, Sir J., 154; Molyneux, Hon. F. G., 141; Monks-well, Lord, 157; Moran, Hon. B., 147; Morley, Samuel, 152; Morris, Prof. J., 125; Munro, Sir C., 149; Muspratt, J., 141  
**NEVILLE-GRENVILLE**, R., 152; Nicholas, M., 151; Norcott, Gen. Sir W. S. R., 126; Norfolk, Duchess of, 134  
**OLIPHANT**, Mrs. L., 124; Ordish, R. M., 154  
**PARFITT**, Mgr. C., 147; Paterson, Mrs. E., 170; Peach, C. W., 131; Pearson, Sir J., 139; Penrhyn, Baron, 134; Perrott, Sir E. G. L., 147; Pim, Rear-Adm. B. L. T., 155; Pittie, Gen. F. G., 175; Pittman, J., 137; Ponchielli, A., 126; Potter, R., 147; Prendergast, T., 169  
**RAMMINGEN**, Freiherr von P., 149; Ranke, Leopold von, 140; Ranken, Very Rev. A., 155; Ransome, R. C., 133; Redesdale, Lord, 138; Regnier, Dr. E., 169; Reilly, Maj.-Gen. W. E. M., 150; Robinson, Sir W. R., 138; Romilly, Hon. E., 149; Ross, H., 175; Rothes, Louisa Dow, Countess of, 126; Rothes, Countess of, 130; Rothschild, Baron M. C. von, 159; Russell, Rev. Lord W., 137  
**SALDANHA**, Duchesse de, 126; Saltoun, Lord, 129; Samsoe, Count D., 137; Scherer, Prof. W., 151; Schwarze, F. O. von, 126; Scindiah, Maharajah, 144; Seeley, R. B., 142; Selwyn, Miss L. F., 169; Seymour, H., 130; Shadwell, Adm. Sir C. F. A., 133; Shaftesbury, Earl of, 137; Sheffield, Sir R., 159; Sherard, Baron, 134; Shipton, Capt. J. M., 133; Simpson, Rev. Canon, 133; Solly, E., 137; Somerset, Gen. E. A., 134; Stamford, C., 134; Stephenson, D., 149; Stirton, G., 134; Stockmar, E. von, 141; Storrar, Dr. J., 133; Stowe, Prof. C. E., 152; Stradbroke, Earl of, 124; Strafford, Earl of, 160; Strathallan, Viscount, 126; Stuart, Sir A., 147; Sturt, Col. C. N., 134; Subhi Pasha, 126  
**TALBOT**, Hon. and Rev. G., 159; Tarver, Rev. C. F., 152; Taylor, Gen. R. G., 131; Taylor, Major W. O'Brien, 175; Taylor, Sir H., 132; Tecchio, S., 126; Temple, C., 141; Tennyson, Hon. L., 137; Theodores, Prof., 133; Thomas

**OBITUARY, continued**

E., 180; Thompson, Dr. W. H., 155; Thurn and Taxis, Princess Mathilde, 126; Tilden, S. J., 151; Torlonia, Prince A., 130; Trafford, Sir H. de, 141; Trench, Archbp., 132; Trench, Rev. F. C., 137; Trevanion, Susannah, 141; Trevelyan, Sir C., 146; Tufnell, E. C., 149; Tulloch, Principal, 128  
**UDNEY-Yule**, Sir G., 125; Uhrich, Gen., 159  
**VALLIER**, Count de St., 129; Vane, Sir H. M., 137; Ventris, Rev. E., 154; Verner, Sir W. E. H., 147; Villebois, H., 134; Vivian, Baron, 138  
**WADDELL**, Capt. J. T., 184; Waitz, G., 141; Wakley, Dr. J. G., 151; Walpole, Col. H., 137; Walpole, Isabella, 149; Watney, J., 169; Waveney, Baron, 130; Webster, Sir A. F. G., 134; Webster, T., 154; Welsh, J., 137; Wheelhouse, Sir W. J., 133; White, Gen. Sir H. D., 134; Wilmot, Vice-Adm. A. P. Eardley, 137; Wilson, Lieut.-Gen. T. F., 131; Wilson, Rev. D., 149; Wood, J. W., 176  
**ORLANDO**, "H.M.S., launch of, 35

**PALL Mall Gazette** "on the Orange Army in Ulster, 23

**PALLAVICINI**, the Marchese, killed in attempting the ascent of the Gross Glockner, 29

**PARIS**, Comte and Comtesse de, and their eldest son arrived at Dover, 27

**PARLIAMENT**.—**QUEEN'S SPEECH** at opening of Parliament [12]; at close of session to dissolve [222]; to prorogue [286]. Opened by Royal Commission, 36, 38; prorogued, 44. Ministry, resignation of [255]; the new [256]. Session, the first, of the eleventh Parliament, 3; prorogued, 27

**ADDRESS**, debate on [13, 14], [261]. **ADMINISTRATION**, the New [37]. **AGRICULTURAL Labourers' Holdings Act** [27]. **ARMS (Ireland) Bill** [188]; second reading [190]. **ARMY Estimates** [75]

**BRADLAUGH**, Mr., takes the oath [9].

**BUDGET**, Sir W. Harcourt's [81]

**CABINET**, resignation of [33]; Mr. Gladstone's [34]. **CAUCUS**, revolt of the [169]. **CHURCH Patronage Bill** [217]; Church of Wales, disestablishment of [66]; of Scotland [67]. **CIVIL Service Estimates** [79]. **CONTAGIOUS Diseases Act**, hospital accommodation [79]

**ELECTION**, the General [252], 34; addresses [224]. **ELECTIONS**: Barrow [93], 15; Bradford [134], 18; Brighton, 56; Croydon, 5; Edinburgh, Southern division, 5; Galway, 7; Hackney, South, 7; Ipswich [133]; King's Lynn, 39; Lancashire, Blackpool division, 39; Newton division, 37; Londonderry, 49; Mid-Armagh, 5; Middlesex, Brentford division, 58; Newcastle, 7; Staffordshire, Burton division, 38; Yorkshire, Buckrose division, 58. **ESTIMATES**, the [276]

**PARLIAMENT, continued**

**FAIR Trade discussion** [219]. **FOREIGN Affairs** [85]

**GOVERNMENT**, defeat of the [38]; Bill, defeat of [85]

**HOME Rule Bill**, second reading, 24

**INFANTS Bill** [218]. **IRISH Government Bill** [94]; second reading [170]

**LAND Purchase Bill (Irish)** [188]; public opinion on [187]. **LUNACY Acts Amendment Bill** [65]

**MARRIAGE Hours Extension Bill** [218]

**NAVY Estimates** [71]

**OFFICERS**, Returning, Bill [220]

**PROCEDURE**, Rules of the New [20]; report on Parliament [221]

**RADICAL programme**, the [7]. **RAILWAY Traffic Bill** [68]

**SCOTCH Crofters Bill** [83]; passed [85].

**SHOP Hours Bill** [218]. **SPEAKER**, election of [9, 257]

**UNIONISTS**, the, attitude of [231]; policy of [257]

**PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES.—**

**ABERCORN**, Duke of, moves the Address [13]. **ARCH**, Mr., on the agricultural labourer [29]. **ARGYLL**, Duke of, at Glasgow [155]; debate on the Address [261]

**BALFOUR**, Mr. A. J., on small tenancies [80]; Scotch Crofters Bill [84]; correspondence with Mr. Gladstone [249].

**BARCLAY**, Mr., on the Agricultural Holdings Act [22]. **BERESFORD**, Lord C., on the state of the Navy [69].

**BOYD-KINNAR** on the Irish Bill [178]. **BRIGHT**, Mr. J., address to his constituents and letter to Mr. Cairne [282]; reply to Mr. Gladstone [249].

**BRYCE**, Mr., on the Irish Bill [188].

**CAIRNE**, Mr., on Home Rule [161]. **CAIRD**, Sir J., on the Irish Land question [135].

**CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN**, Mr., on the Army estimates [76]; on the Irish Bill [177].

**CARNARVON**, Lord, explanation of Mr. Parnell's assertion [217].

**CHAMBERLAIN**, Mr., his Radical programme [7]; on the agricultural labourers [26]; address to his electors [42]; resignation [90], [144], 14; reasons for it [103], [145]; at Birmingham [158], [225], [304]; at Devonshire House [180], [257]; on the Irish Bill [201]; Mr. Parnell's amendment [270].

**CHAPLIN** on small holdings [27]. **CHILDERS**, Mr., on the Irish question [3, 4], [192].

**CHURCHILL**, Lord R., debate on the Address [19], [263]; Irish policy of the Conservatives [48]; at Manchester [58]; Government of Ireland Bill [112]; attack on Mr. Gladstone [199]; address to the electors of South Paddington [239]; Egyptian affairs [283]; at Dartford [285], 45; Bradford [287], 49; **COLLINGS**, Mr. J., his resolution [25].

**COURTNEY**, Mr., Bill for the franchise of women [56]; on Home Rule [161].

**COWPER**, Lord, on abolishing the Viceroyalty [24]; at the meeting at Her Majesty's Theatre [129].

**CROSS**, Sir R., on the Irish Bill [182].

**DILLON**, Mr., on the

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

Irish Bill [179]; at Castlereagh [298]; DIXON, Mr. G., at the Unionist Liberals' meeting [299]. FERGUSSON, Sir J., on Egyptian affairs [283]. FINLAY, Mr., on the Irish Bill [192]. FOWLER, Mr. H., at Manchester [296]. GIBSON, Mr., on the Government of Ireland Bill [114]. GLADSTONE, Mr., and the Irish loyalists [11]; on the Queen's Speech [14]; small holdings, [28]; address to his electors [41]; at the re-assembling of Parliament [55]; disestablishment of the Church in Wales, 67; proposal to abolish the House of Lords [65]; additional grant to the Volunteer force [75]; Irish Government Bill [94]; defence of his Bill [118], 16; Land Purchase Bill [138]; on the expression "vital" [150]; manifesto to the electors of Midlothian [164], 19; second reading of Irish Bill [170]; Arms Bill [189]; at the Foreign Office [194]; reply to Sir M. Hicks-Beach [198]; speech to close the debate [212]; address at Midlothian [226]; in Scotland [233]; at Manchester [241], Liverpool [244]; letter to Mr. Bright [247]; correspondence with Mr. Balfour [250]; on the Irish policy [268]; the general policy of the Government [269]; pamphlet on the Irish question [272], 39; Tenants' Relief Bill [280]. GOSCHEN, Mr., on the agricultural labourer [29]; Government of Ireland Bill [116]; at Edinburgh [163]; Paisley [167]; Leeds and Preston [168]; criticisms on the Irish Bill [205]; address to the electors of East Edinburgh [230]; and the "Unionist Cause" [300]. GRANVILLE, Lord, on the Queen's Speech [13]; at the National Liberal Club [134]. GREY, Earl, on Irish Government [3]. HAMILTON, Lord G., on the Irish question [9]; Irish Bill [178]. HAMLEY, Sir E., on the cost of the Volunteers [75]. HARCOURT, Sir W., on the Government of Ireland Bill [115]; reply to Lord R. Churchill [199]; on Mr. Chamberlain's defence of the Government policy [271]; Tenants' Relief Bill [283]. HARTINGTON, Lord, on Mr. J. Collings' amendment [32]; at the Eighty Club [61]; defence of the Whigs [106]; at the meeting at Her Majesty's Theatre [130]; at Rossendale [156]; at Edinburgh [163]; on the second reading of the Irish Bill [172]; at Devonshire House [180], [257]; at Bradford [186]; on the Irish Bill [203]; on the motions for adjournment [199]; his manifesto [229]; at Sheffield and Cardiff [245]; on the Irish policy [265]; Tenants' Relief Bill [281]; at the Unionist Liberals' meeting [299]. HEALY, Mr., reply to Mr. Chamberlain [106]. HIBBERT, Mr., on the Navy Estimates [71]. HICKS-BEACH, Sir M., reply to Mr. Gladstone [16]; on Mr. J. Col-

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

lings' Resolution [31]; Army Estimates [76]; Government of Ireland Bill [117]; Arms Bill [190]; Home Rule Bill [197]; Irish Bill [209]; Irish policy [264]; Tenants' Relief Bill [281]. HOLMES, Mr. H., on the Irish question [21]. HUNTER, Mr. W. A., amendment withdrawn [22]. JAMES, Sir H., speech to his constituents [57]; debate on the Irish Bill [176]. JENNINGS, Mr., on the fiscal system [219]. KILMOREY, Lord, proposes the abolition of the Viceroyalty [28]. LABOUCHERE, Mr., moves to abolish the House of Lords [65]; at Manchester [295]. LEATHAM, Mr., on the Irish Bill [179]. LECKY, Mr. W. E., on Irish government [3]. LEWIS, Mr. C. E., on the Irish Bill [175]. LONG, Mr. W., at Melksham [302]. LUBBOCK, Sir J., his Shop Hours Regulation Bill [57]; on the Irish Bill [106]. MACDONALD, Mr. J. H., Scotch Crofters Bill [83]. MACKINTOSH, Mr. F., Scotch Crofters Bill [84]. MAXWELL, Sir H., Scotch Crofters Bill [83]. MONTEAGUE, Lord, on the Irish Land question [137]. MORLEY, Mr. J., at Chelmsford [5]; Chief Secretary for Ireland [35]; address to his electors [43]; on eviction [56]; defence of the Bill for Ireland [110]; at Newcastle [153], [235], [244]; at Glasgow [162]; on the Arms Bill [188]; Irish Bill [204]; policy of the Government [216]; at Bradford [234]; on Ireland [266]; amendment of the Address [275]; Tenants' Relief Bill [281]; in Scotland [297]. MUNDELLA, Mr., his Railway Traffic Bill [68]. O'BRIEN, Mr. W., on the Irish Bill [175]. O'CONNOR, Mr. T., on the Irish Bill [203]. PARNELL, Mr., defence of the Land League [18]; on the Irish Government Bill [102], [208]; Land Purchase Bill [148]; Arms Bill [189]; amendment on the debate [268]; his Tenants' Relief Bill [277]. PLAYFAIR, Sir L., on the Education Bill [80]. PLUNKET, Mr., on the Irish Government Bill [103]. RAMSAY, Mr., Scotch Crofters Bill [83]. ROSEBERY, Lord, on the policy with Greece [55]; at Newcastle [289]. RUSSELL, Sir C., on the Bill for Ireland [113]. SALISBURY, Lord, reply to the deputation from Belfast [12]; on the Queen's Speech [13]; on abolishing the Viceroyalty [24]; Conservative policy [51]; his forecasts [53]; at the Crystal Palace, on Mr. Gladstone's "reversible" policy [59]; at St. James's Hall [181]; on the integrity of the Empire [227]; at Leeds [233], 36; urges Lord Hartington to form a ministry [255]; at the Lord Mayor's banquet [260]; debate on the address [261]; at the Guildhall [294]; ad-

PARLIAMENTARY SPEECHES, *cont.*

dress to the City Conservatives [801].  
 SAUNDERSON, Col., amendment on the Address [275]. SELBORNE, Lord, letter to the *Times* [155]; at the Unionist Liberals' meeting [299]. SEXTON, Mr., on the Irish question [21]; Irish Bill [202]; on Mr. Chamberlain's defence of the Government policy [271]; amendment on the Address [274]. SHAW-Lefevre, Mr., amendment on the proposed expenditure for the Navy [78]; the Irish Bill [185]. SMITH, Mr. W. H., on the Home and Colonial defences [78]; Estimates [276]. SPENCER, Lord, at Newcastle [151]; at Leeds [167]; at Chester [228]; Bristol [238]; Manchester [296]. STANSFELD, Mr., on the Irish Bill [188]. STEPHEN, Sir J., on Home Rule [2]. STUART, Prof., at Darlington [801].  
 THURLOW, Lord, on opening the British Museum and National Gallery on Sundays [65], 13. TREVELYAN, Mr., on the condition of Ireland [10]; amendment of the Scotch Crofters Bill [88], [184]; resignation [90], 14; on the Irish Government Bill [99], [193].  
 VINCENT, Mr., on the requirements of the Volunteer force [75].  
 WHITBREAD, Mr., on the Government of Ireland Bill [114]. WINTERBOTHAM, Mr., on the Irish Bill [204].  
 PASTEUR, M., number of persons cured of hydrophobia, 10; eighteen Russian peasants under treatment, 12; number of persons inoculated, 51.  
 — Institute, grant of 200,000 fr., 23.  
 PATTI, Mdme., and Signor Nicolini married, 25.  
 PENNY, "Old Neptune," fined 5*l.*, 23.  
 PERCIVAL, Dr., head master of Rugby, 54.  
 PERU [489].—BUDGET [489]; CACERES, Gen., elected President [489]; Civil War [489].  
 PETRIE, Mr. Flinders, discovery of "Pharaoh's House in Tahpahnes," 26.  
 PETROLEUM well struck near Suez, 11.  
 PLYMOUTH, collapse of a shop, 13.  
 POPP, M., acquitted by the Tribunal of the Seine, 57.  
 PORTSMOUTH, naval review, 33.  
 PORTUGAL [396].—BRAGA-Guimaraens question [396]. BUDGET [397].  
 CONCORDAT with the Vatican [400].  
 DAHOMEY protectorate [398]. DON CARLOS, his marriage [399].  
 FINANCES [398].  
 KING'S Speech [396].  
 RECESS [399]. REGENCY during the King's absence [400].  
 POTATO Tercentenary Conference, 57.  
 RESS, opinions of the, on the defeat of the Government [33]; the Gladstone-Morley Government [38-41]; Lord R. Churchill's speech [51, 57]; Lord Hartington at the Eighty Club [64]; forecasts of the Irish Bills [87]; resignation of Messrs. Chamberlain and Trevelyan [90]; on the Irish Bill [121-129].

"PRIMROSE Day" celebrated, 18.

PRIZE fight for the "Championship of England," at Paris, 8.

"PUNCH," the editor of, committed for trial for libel, 57.

QUEEN Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital, new wing opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales, 27.

QUEEN Victoria, opened Parliament in state, 4; attended the performance of *Mors et Vita* at the Albert Hall, 9; opened the International Exhibition at Liverpool, 20; visited the Colonial section of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, 22; fiftieth year of her reign celebrated by a special form of service, 27; held a Council at Windsor, 28; Colonial and Indian visitors entertained at luncheon, 29; received a number of natives of her foreign dominions, 31; in Edinburgh, 88.

QUEENSLAND [500]; CUSTOMS revenue [502]; DEFENCES, Colonial [501]; finances [502]; members, payment of [501]; mining statistics [502]; separation of north and south [500].

RACES.—ASCOT, 25; ASTON Grounds, between George and Cuming, 45; BICYCLE Championship of Europe, 37; CESAREWITCH Stakes, 47; CHESTER Cup, 19; The DERBY, 22; DONCASTER Champion Stakes, 42; ECLIPSE Stakes, 38; EPSOM Spring Meeting, 15; FOUR-Mile Championship at Preston, 41; GOODWOOD, 84; GRAND Prix de Paris, 24; HENLEY Regatta, 31; INTER-University Athletic Sports, 15; St. LEGER Stakes, 42; LIVERPOOL Cup, 32; MANCHESTER Cup, 26; MIDDLE Park Plate, 47; NEWMARKET, Cambridgeshire Stakes, 49, and 2,000 Guinea Stakes, 18; New York Yacht Club, 41; The OAKS, 22; SCHOONER Yacht Race, Newport, U.S., 45; SCULLING Championship of England, 22; CHAMPIONSHIP of the World, 44; GREAT International, 47; INTERNATIONAL, 40; between D. Godwin and N. Matterson, 24; between Beach and Gandaur, 42; TRICYCLE Championship of Europe, 38.

RAILWAY accidents, number of persons killed and injured, 18.

RIFLES, 100,000 repeating or magazine, issued to the German army, 47.

RIPON, 1,000th anniversary of its incorporation celebrated, 39.

ROUEN, a lady shot by her husband, 24.

— Gaillon prison, revolt of prisoners, 61.

ROYAL Albert Docks, wall removed by blasting, 18.

— Irish Fusiliers, the 7th, new colours presented to the 1st battalion by Lady A. Edgecumbe, 41.

— Society, annual meeting and distribution of gold medals, 56.

RUSSIA [365].—AFGHAN Boundary Commissioners [366].



**RUSSIA, continued**

BATOUK ceased to be a free port [366], 30. BULGARIAN question [367]

CZAR'S Imperial progress [365]; address to the officers and men of the Black Sea fleet, 22

IMPERIAL family, incomes reduced, 32

ST. PETERSBURG "Monument of Glory" unveiled, 49; Cabinet, the, notified that Batouk ceased to be a free port [366], 30

SALISBURY, Lord, deputation of the unemployed, 6; at Leeds [233], 26

SAMOA [507].—COCOA-nut plantations [508]; Malietoa, King, his authority recognised [507]; population [508]

SCHNADHORST, Mr., testimonial to, 49

SCIENCE, retrospect of, 108.—

ASTRONOMY, eclipse, total solar, 117; velocity of light, 117; asteroids, 117; double stars, 117; lunar heat, 118; stellar photography, 118; horizon, new form of artificial, 118

BIOLOGY, *Danais archippus*, American butterfly, extensive range, 114; coagulation of blood, 114; symbiosis in plants, 115; lumbar curve of man and apes, 115

CHEMISTRY, new elements, 108; hydrogen gas, manufacture of, 109; metallic sulphates, use of, in agriculture, 109; free nitrogen, absorption of, 109; dyes, 109; saccharin, 109; alkali metals, physiological action of, 110; chloral, new substitute for, 110

GEOGRAPHY, Asia, railway communication, 119; M. Potanin's explorations in North China, 119; Corea, Mr. W. Carles' details, 120; Hosie, Mr. A., explorations in Western China, 121; Siberia, North, explorations in, 121; Africa, Congo River, 121; Kerr, Mr. W. M., journey to Lake Nyassa, 121; Brazza, M. de, ten years' work in the Congo basin, 122; Fischer, Dr., report from Kahegi, 123; Lenz, Dr., search for Dr. Junker, 123; Palat, M., murdered in the Sahara, 123; Aubrey, M., mission to Shoa, 123

GEOLOGY, Elgin reptilian beds, 116; Nile borings, 116; earthquakes and eruptions, 116

PHYSICS, dilatancy, 110; batteries, new primary, 111; self-induction of an electric current, 111; Ben Nevis earth-currents, 112; permanent magnetic polarity, 112; photography, sub-aqueous, 113

SEABRIGHT, Mr. A. B., and Miss Lena Scott, marriage declared void, 54

SEMPACH, battle of, 500th anniversary celebrated, 29

SERPENTINE, accident on the, 2

SERVICE Order for officers of the army and navy proclaimed, 52

SEVERN Tunnel opened for goods traffic, 40

SHAFTESBURY, the Earl, shot himself in a fit of temporary insanity, 16

SHAKESPEARE'S *Hamlet* produced for the first time at the Théâtre Français, 44

SHELLEY'S *Cenci* performed at the Imperial Theatre, Islington, 21

SHIPPING Disasters.—"Goshawk," fourteen sailors drowned, 33; "Imogene," ashore at Constantinople, 49; "Lake Huron," stranded, 50; "Ly-co-moo" steamer wrecked, 23; "Missouri," total wreck off Holyhead, 10; "Oregon" collision, 12; "Parlement Belge" struck on Dover Pier, 13; "Pavonia" stranded, 50; "Persian Monarch" stranded, 50; Southport and Blackpool lifeboats capsized, 58; "Suffolk," struck on the rocks off the Lizard, 44; "Sultan," collision with the "Ville de Victoria," 60; "Tagus," driven ashore at Bahia, 28; "Tom White," Mississippi steamer, burnt, 59

SION College, the new, opened by the Prince and Princess of Wales, 59

SKELETON of a man discovered in St. George's-in-the-East, 34

SKYE, Island of, expedition to enforce the sheriff's decrees, 53

SMITH, Mr. W. H., Chief Secretary for Ireland [12]

SNOWSTORMS.—England, Scotland, and Ireland, 2, 10, 12; Germany, 60; London and South of England, 61; United States, 6; Welsh mountains, 11

SOCIAL Science Association dissolved, 17

SOCIALIST meeting at Manchester, 9; in Trafalgar Square, 52, 54

—procession on the Lord Mayor's Day forbidden, 50, 51

SOCOTRA, Island of, annexed as a British possession, 50

SOLAR halo and mock suns observed near Greenwich, 15

SPAIN [391].—ALFONSO XIII., birth of [394]; proclaimed King, 21; presented to the Virgin by his mother, 28

CARTAGENA, Fort St. Julian surprised by mutineers [394], 2. COLONIAL affairs [394]. COMMERCIAL convention for fixing the alcoholic scale for wine duties, 20. CORTES, debates of the [393]; reopening of [396]; grant of Home Rule to Cuba rejected, 27

DEPUTIES, election of [392]. DYNAMITERS [396]

IZQUIERDO, Mgr., shot, 17

MADRID, republican rising at [394], 43; ministerial complications [391]; Cabinet, resignation of [395]; change of Ministry [395]. MODUS Vivendi Bill [393]

PRESS, position of [396]

SERGEANTS, the first, transferred to the reserves, 50. SEVILLE, Duke of, imprisonment and escape [396]

SPEAKER, the, letter from some of the Radical members for a relaxation of the Court dress at his dinners and levees, 14

STANLEY, Colonel, received the Grand Cross of the Bath, 11

STAPLE Inn, Holborn, sold by auction, 55

"STATIST," the, on Home Rule, 47

STEAD, Mr. W., released from Holloway gaol, 3

Election Petition, judgment 15  
 Mr. T., bicycle journey of nearly miles, 54  
 Mr., appointed judge of the 1<sup>st</sup> Division, 21  
 —Aldershot, Guildford, and Ayles-  
 48; England, 14; France,  
 eastern, 36; Cape Hatteras to  
 dor, 8; Indiana and Ohio, 21;  
 s City, Missouri, 20; Labrador,  
 Swansea, 40; United Kingdom,  
 —BROOKLYN, Decazeville, 25;  
 York, 10, 24; Chicago, 19; Liège  
 Mons, Belgium, 26; Smethwick,  
 ngham, 9; Tyne and Wear ship-  
 ts, 2, 11  
 ce on the North British Railway,  
 , 411.—BUDGET, 412. Failures,  
 or of [413]. Oscar, Prince, ques-  
 of appanage [412]. Protection  
 Railways opened [413]. Stock-  
 agricultural exhibition [411]  
 LAND [388]. —COMMERCIAL  
 with Germany [389]  
 ns [390]  
 , Mgr., intended reforms [389].  
 STURM established [391]  
 , taxation of [388]  
 [505]. Federal Council, the  
 assembled at Hobart [505];  
 ue [506]  
 Sir R., at a meeting of the School  
 for London, 6  
 Sir H., peerage conferred, 35  
 , Lord, on opening the national  
 tions in the metropolis on Sundays  
 13  
 new deep sea docks opened, 17  
 n England, successful cultivation  
 istow, 43  
 ridge, first stone laid by the Prince  
 les, 27  
 Union Congress at Hull, 40  
 AL, 458.—Gold discovery [458],  
 AN, Mr. G., resigns his seat in  
 Gladstone's Cabinet [90], 14  
 Lord, discovery of his jewels, 9  
 and the minor States of Eastern  
 e [369]  
 IA [375]; Alexander, Prince,  
 bduction [376], 38; abdication  
 , 41; crown offered to Prince  
 smar of Denmark, 52; to Prince  
 and of Saxe-Coburg, 59; candi-  
 for the throne [381], 53; con-  
 ors arrested, 39; elections, 47;  
 ars, General, at Sofia [379];  
 meeting in support of the Re-  
 , 45  
 STINOPLE protocol [371]; at-  
 to murder the Grand Vizier,  
 , warlike preparations [369];  
 ide [373]; Analipsis, hostilities  
 en Greek and Turkish outposts,  
 thens, departure of the represen-

TURKEY, &c., continued  
 tatives of the various European powers,  
 20  
 ROUMELIA, Eastern [370]; seized by  
 the Montenegrins, recovered, 51  
 SERBIA [374]; peace concluded with  
 Bulgaria, 10  
 UNITED STATES [466].—AMERICAN  
 and Mexican dispute about Cutting  
 [470, 473]  
 BARTHOLDI's statue of Liberty inaugu-  
 rated [472]  
 CHARLESTON earthquake [478]. CHI-  
 CAGO, Socialist riot [476]; plot dis-  
 covered, 3; strike, 19; Spies his  
 incendiary appeal [476]; Irish National  
 Convocation [477]. CLEVELAND,  
 Pres., messages to Congress [466];  
 married to Miss Folson, 28  
 FINANCIAL condition [473]. FISHERIES  
 question, the [467, 473]  
 IMPORT duty on works of art abandoned,  
 59  
 LAND question [474]. St. Louis, East,  
 disturbance by railway workmen on  
 strike, 16  
 MANNING, Mr., his Annual Report [474].  
 MESSAGE, the President's [413]. MIL-  
 WAUKEE, outrage of men on strike, 19  
 OBITUARY [479]  
 SESSION, first, of the 49th Congress [472];  
 second [472]. STRIKES and labour  
 agitations [475]  
 TEXAS, Fort Worth, railway blockade  
 broken, 15. TREASURER's Annual  
 Report [475]  
 URUGUAY [488].—ARREDONDO, Gen.,  
 his invasion with the revolutionary  
 army [488]; railway progress [489];  
 Santos, Gen., attempt to assassinate  
 [489], 38  
 VELSAYRE, Mme. A. de, challenged Miss  
 Booth, 18  
 VENEZUELA [490].—BLANCO, Gen.,  
 return of [490]; finance [490]  
 VICTOR Napoleon, Prince, thrown from his  
 carriage, 26  
 VICTORIA [497].—BUDGET [498]; finan-  
 cial condition [497]; Irrigation Bill  
 [498]; New Hebrides question [499];  
 Revenue [500]  
 VOLCANOES.—Etna, Mount, 21, 24; New  
 Zealand, Talavera Lake, 24; island of  
 Galita, 39  
 "VOLTA," the, crossed from Dover to  
 Calais, 42  
 VOLUNTEERS, the Metropolitan, annual  
 manœuvres at Dover and Portsmouth,  
 18  
 WALES, Prince of, at Brighton, 27; installed  
 Grand Master of the Mark Masons, 29;  
 proposal of a Colonial and Indian In-  
 stitute to commemorate the Queen's  
 Jubilee, 43; request that any funds in-  
 tended as a recognition of his services  
 be devoted to the furtherance of it, 44.

**WALKE, Prince of, continued**

precautions for the safety of himself and sons on their visit to Eaton Hall, 4

— — — and Princess, opened the new bridge over the Thames, 28; laid the foundation stone of the People's Palace of Recreation, 28; opened a new wing of the Royal Victoria Hospital, Chelsea, 28; the Grand Cross of the Imperial Order of the Chrysanthemum conferred on him by the Mikado [444]

**WARREN, Sir C.**, succeeds Sir E. Y. Henderson as Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, 14

**WATERSPOUTS** over Bordeaux and Wetzlar, 22; over the town of Nancy, 24

**WATSON, Rev. A.**, President of Brazenose College, Oxford, 9

**WELSH** farmers' meeting to consider the distraining for tithes, 39

**WEST, Mr. H. H.**, unseated for acts of bribery, 15

**WEST INDIES** [485].—**BRITISH** Guiana [486]; cane-sugar cultivation [486]; boundary line of Venezuela [487]

**GRENADA** [486]

**WEST INDIES, continued**

**JAMAICA** [485]; retrenchments [485]

**REVENUE**, expenditure [486]

**TRINIDAD** [486]; Crown lands, sale of [486]; estimates [486]

**ST. VINCENT** [486]; hurricane [486]

**WILLIAMS, Dr.**, of Chicago, elected Treasurer of the Fenian Brotherhood, 56

**WINDERMERE** Lake frozen over, 7

**WOODFORD** trials postponed, 58

**WYATT, Mr.**, recovered 500*l.* damages from the Rosherville Gardens Company, 5

**YARMOUTH**, rioting at, 8

**ZANZIBAR** [462].—**AGREEMENT** between England and Germany [463]; commission to define the German territory [462]

**ZULULAND** and Natal [455].—**BOER** encroachments [456]; Havelock, Sir A., negotiations with the Boers [456]; opening speech to the Legislative Council [457]; revenue [457]; tariff, the new, adopted [457]

**ZURICH**, Primary Education Laws [390]; Anarchist riots, 26

# NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS

IN COURSE OF PUBLICATION BY

## MESSRS. RIVINGTON

WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON

APRIL, 1887.

---

### *A Sketch of the Life and Episcopate of*

the Right Reverend Robert Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop of Ripon, 1857-1884.

By his Son, Montague Cyril Bickersteth, M.A., Vicar of S. Paul's, Pudsey, Leeds. With a Preface by his Cousin, Edward Henry Bickersteth, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter.

*With Portrait. 8vo. 12s.*

### *Sermons Preached to Harrow Boys.*

By the Rev. J. E. C. Welldon, M.A., Head Master of Harrow School.

*Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

### *The Life of Christopher Wordsworth,*

D.D., Bishop of Lincoln.

Edited by Elizabeth Wordsworth, and John Henry Overton, M.A.

Canon of Lincoln, and Rector of Epworth.

*With Portraits. Two Vols. 8vo.*

*[In the Press.]*

---

8, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

## *Sermons.*

By James Russell Woodford, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely.  
 Edited by Herbert Mortimer Luckock, D.D., one of his Examining Chaplains.

*Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 5s. each Sold separately.*

Vol. I. Old Testament Subjects.

Vol. 2. New Testament Subjects.

## *Sketches of Church and State in the*

*First Eight Centuries.*

By the Rev. William Armitage, B.A., Vicar of Scotforth, Lancaster;  
 late Scholar of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

*Crown 8vo.*

*Nearly ready.*

## *The Blessed Dead in Paradise.*

Four All Saints' Day Sermons, preached in Salisbury Cathedral.

By Robert G. Swayne, M.A., Chancellor and Canon Residentiary.

*Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *Studies in St. Paul's Epistle to the*

*Galatians.*

By the Rev. W. S. Wood, M.A., Rector of Ufford, Stamford.

*Crown 8vo.*

*[Nearly ready.]*

## *John Wesley and Modern Methodism.*

By the Rev. Frederick Hockin, M.A., Rector of Phillack, Hon. Canon of Truro, and Proctor in Convocation.

*Crown 8vo.*

*[Nearly ready.]*

## *The Churchman's Clock.*

Meditations, etc., suggested by each hour of the day and night.

With a Preface by the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Warden of the House of Mercy, Clewer, and Honorary Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

*Crown 8vo.*

*[Nearly ready.]*

## *The Christian Ministry.*

By the Rev. Charles Gore, M.A., Principal of Pusey House, Oxford.

*8vo.*

*[In preparation.]*

---

3; WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.



.....

## *Faculties and Difficulties for Belief*

and Disbelief.

By **Francis Paget, D.D.**, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

*Crown 8vo.*

[*Nearly ready.*]

## *Rational Aspects of some Revealed*

Truths.

By **Edward B. Ottley, M.A.**, Minister of Quebec Chapel ; lately the Principal of Salisbury Diocesan Theological College.

*Crown 8vo.*

[*Nearly ready.*]

## *A Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D.,*

Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

By **H. P. Liddon, D.D.**, Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

*8vo.*

[*In preparation.*]

## *Life of S. Francis of Assisi.*

By **H. L. Sidney Lear**, Author of "Life of Lacordaire," etc.

*Crown 8vo.*

[*In preparation.*]

## *De Vitâ Pastoralî.*

The Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of GOD.

By the **Lord Bishop of Lichfield.**

*Crown 8vo.*

[*In preparation.*]

## *Creed and Character: Sermons.*

By **Henry Scott Holland, M.A.**, Canon of St. Paul's.

*Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

## *The Bishops in the Tower.*

A Record of Stirring Events affecting the Church and Nonconformists from the Restoration to the Revolution.

By **Herbert Mortimer Luckock, D.D.**, Canon of Ely, and Principal of the Theological College.

*Crown 8vo. 6s.*

## *Works of John Kaye, Bishop of Lincoln,*

*New Edition. 8 vols. 8vo. Sold separately. [In the Press.]*

CHARGES, delivered to the Clergy of the Dioceses of Bristol and Lincoln together with some other Speeches and Essays.

SERMONS AND ADDRESSES, delivered on various occasions.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE WRITINGS OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF THE SECOND AND THIRD CENTURIES.

Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF EUSEBIUS.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA, IN CONNECTION WITH THE LIFE OF ATHANASIUS.

MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

## *Of the Imitation of Christ.*

In Four Books. By Thomas à Kempis.

Translated and Edited by the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A., Rector of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire.

*Large Type Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Order of the Administration of the*

Holy Communion, and the Form of Solemnization of Matrimony, according to the Use of the Church of England.

*With Rubrics in Red. Large Type. Royal 8vo. 10s. 6d.*

## *The Great Commission.*

Twelve Addresses on the Ordinal.

By James Russell Woodford, D.D., sometime Lord Bishop of Ely.

Edited, with an Introduction on the Ordinations of his Episcopate, by Herbert Mortimer Luckock, D.D., one of his Examining Chaplains.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

## *The Hopes and Decisions of the Passion*

of our Most Holy Redeemer.

By W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross, Staffordshire.

*Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Man of God.*

Being Six Addresses delivered during Lent, 1886, at the Primary Ordination of the Right Rev. the Lord Alwyne Compton, Bishop of Ely.

By the Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt, M.A., Vicar of Malvern Link.

*Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

.....

*Selections from the Writings of H. P.*

Liddon, D.D., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.  
*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

*Selections from the Writings of John*

Keble, M.A., Author of "The Christian Year."  
*Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

*Selections from the Writings of Edward*

Bouverie Pusey, D.D., late Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.  
*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

*Selections from the Writings of John*

Mason Neale, D.D., late Warden of Sackville College.  
*Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

*The Three Hours' Agony of our Blessed*

Redeemer. Being Addresses in the form of Meditations delivered in S. Alban's Church, Manchester, on Good Friday, 1877.

By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

*New Edition. Small 8vo. 2s. ; or in Paper Cover, 1s.*

*Holy Week in Norwich Cathedral.*

Being Seven Lectures on the several Members of the Most Sacred Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, delivered at Evensong on each day of the Holy Week, in the Cathedral Church of the Holy and Undivided Trinity of Norwich.

By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., D.C.L., Dean of Norwich.

*Crown 8vo. 5s.*

*Iona and other Verses.*

By William Bright, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History.

*Small 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *Constitutional Loyalty and other Words*

"necessary for these times."

By D. P. Chase, D.D., Fellow of Oriel College, Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford.

*Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *Life and Writings of Charles Leslie,*

M.A., Non-juring Divine.

By the Rev. R. J. Leslie, M.A., Vicar of Holbeach S. John.

*With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

## *The Reformation of the Church of*

England; its History, Principles, and Results.

By John Henry Blunt, D.D., Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," etc., etc.

*Two Vols. 8vo. Sold separately.*

Vol. I. A.D. 1514-1547. Its progress during the reign of Henry VIII.  
*Fifth Edition. 16s.*

Vol. II. A.D. 1547-1662. From the Death of Henry VIII. to the Restoration of the Church after the Commonwealth. 18s.

## *A Companion to the New Testament;*

being a Plain Commentary on Scripture History from the Birth of our Lord to the End of the Apostolic Age.

By John Henry Blunt, D.D., Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," etc., etc.

*With Maps. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Path of the Just, and other Sermons,*

preached in S. Martin's Church, Scarborough.

By R. Henning Parr, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge, Vicar.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s.*

## *Studies in the History of the Book of*

Common Prayer. The Anglican Reform—The Puritan Innovations—The Elizabethan Reaction—The Caroline Settlement. With Appendices.

By Herbert Mortimer Luckock, D.D., Canon of Ely, etc.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

## *Plain Sermons on the Catechism.*

By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford; Author of a "Devotional Commentary on the Gospel Narrative."  
*Two Vols. New Edition. Crown 8vo. 5s. each. Sold separately.*

## *Sermons preached for the most part in*

Manchester.

By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

## *Manuals of Religious Instruction.*

Edited by John Pilkington Norris, D.D., Archdeacon of Bristol, and Canon Residentiary of Bristol Cathedral.

I. THE CATECHISM AND PRAYER BOOK.

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT.

III. THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*New and Revised Editions. Small 8vo. 3s. 6d. each. Sold separately.*

## *Sermons, Parochial and Occasional.*

By J. B. Mozley, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

## *Lyra Apostolica.*

[Poems by J. W. BOWDEN, R. H. FROUDE, J. KEBLE, J. H. NEWMAN, R. I. WILBERFORCE, and I. WILLIAMS; with a New Preface by CARDINAL NEWMAN.]

*New Edition. With red borders. 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

## *A Book of Household Prayer.*

Mainly taken from the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, and from "A Book of Family Prayer, compiled by Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds" (afterwards Dean of Chichester).

By George Thomas Duncombe.

*Small 8vo. 2s.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.



## *The Story of Norway.*

By Charlotte S. Sidgwick.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Story of Russia.*

By M. E. Benson.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Story of Switzerland.*

By Theresa Melville Lee.

With a Preface by the Hon. Mrs. Lionel Tollemache.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Story of Holland.*

By Isabel Don.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Story of Iceland.*

By Letitia M. MacColl.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.*

[*Nearly ready.*]

## *The Story of Spain.*

By Julia F. Huxley.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.*

[*In preparation.*]

## *The Story of Denmark.*

By Charlotte S. Sidgwick.

*With Illustrations. Crown 8vo.*

[*In preparation.*]

## *By the King and Queen : a Story of the*

*Dawn of Religion in Britain.*

By Mrs. Jerome Mercier, Author of "Our Mother Church," etc.

*With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 2s.*

## *The House of Walderne : a Tale of the*

*Cloister and the Forest, in the days of the Barons' Wars.*

By the Rev. A. D. Crake, B.A., Fellow of the Royal Historical Society.

Author of the "Chronicles of Æscendune," etc., etc.

*Second Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

## *Prayers for a Young Schoolboy.*

By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Edited, with a Preface, by  
H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.  
*Large type. Second Edition. 24mo. 1s.*

## *Lectures and other Theological Papers.*

By J. B. Mozley, D.D., late Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor  
of Divinity in the University of Oxford.  
*8vo. 10s. 6d.*

## *The Life and Times of the Right*

Reverend John Leslie, D.D., Bishop of the Isles, Scotland; and of Raphoe  
and Clogher, Ireland. With preliminary Sketches of other eminent persons  
in the Leslie family, A.D. 1525-1675.

By the Rev. R. J. Leslie, M.A., Vicar of Holbeach S. John, Author  
of "Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, Non-juring Divine."  
*Crown 8vo. 6s.*

## *The Litany and the Commination Ser-*

vice. From the Book of Common Prayer.

*With Rubrics in red. Royal 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *Maxims and Gleanings from the*

Writings of T. T. Carter, M.A. Selected and arranged for Daily use.

By C. M. S., Compiler of "Daily Gleanings of the Saintly Life,"  
"Under the Cross," etc. With an Introduction by the Rev. M. F.  
Sadler, Rector of Honiton, Devon.

*Crown 16mo. 2s.*

## *The Mystery of the Passion of our Most*

Holy Redeemer.

By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Wor-  
cester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

*Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Lord's Table; or, Meditations on*

the Holy Communion Office in the Book of Common Prayer.

By E. H. Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop of Exeter.

*Second Edition. 16mo. 1s.; or Cloth extra, 2s.*

## *Thoughts upon the Liturgical Gospels*

for the Sundays, one for each day in the year. With an introduction on their origin, history, the modifications made in them by the Reformers and by the Revisers of the Prayer Book, the honour always paid to them in the Church, and the proportions in which they are drawn from the Writings of the Four Evangelists.

By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., D.C.L., Dean of Norwich.

*Second Edition. Two Vols. Crown 8vo. 16s.*

## *Meditations upon the Liturgical Gospels*

For the minor Festivals of Christ, the two first week-days of the Easter and Whitsun Festivals, and the Red-letter Saints' Days. To which is prefixed some account of the origin of Saints' Days, and their Evens or Vigils; of the pruning of the Calendar of the English Church by the Reformers; and of the re-introduction of the Black-Letter Festivals, with separate notices of the Four which were re-introduced in the Prayer-Book of 1552.

By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D.D., D.C.L., Dean of Norwich.

*Crown 8vo. 8s. 6d.*

## *Yesterday, To-Day, and For Ever.*

A Poem in Twelve Books.

By Edward Henry Bickersteth, D.D., Bishop of Exeter.

*One Shilling Edition, 18mo; With red borders, 16mo, 2s. 6d.*

*The Crown 8vo Edition may still be had, 5s.*

## *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the*

Romans. The Authorised Version 1611, arranged in Paragraphs, and in Dialogues, with Notes.

By D. P. Chase, D.D., Fellow of Oriel College, Principal of S. Mary Hall, Oxford.

*Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.; or in Paper Cover, 2s.*

## *Parochial Sermons.*

Mostly preached at Brighstone.

By George Moberly, D.C.L., late Bishop of Salisbury.

*Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.*

## *Private Prayers.*

By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Edited, with a Preface, by H. P. Liddon, D.D., Canon Residentiary and Chancellor of St. Paul's.

*Second Edition. Royal 32mo. 2s. 6d.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

*Corpus Christi.*

A Manual of Devotion for the Blessed Sacrament.

With a Preface by the Rev. H. Montagu Villiers, Vicar of S. Paul's, Wilton Place.

*With red borders. Royal 32mo. 2s.*

*Cheap Edition, without the Red Borders. 1s.*

*Maxims and Gleanings from the*

Writings of John Keble, M.A. Selected and arranged for daily use.

By C. M. S., Compiler of "Daily Gleanings of the Saintly Life," "Under the Cross," etc. With an Introduction by the Rev. M. F. Sadler, Rector of Honiton, Devon.

*Crown 16mo. 2s.*

*Conversion. Being Lenten Sermons.*

By the Rev. John Eddowes, M.A., Magdalene College, Cambridge; Incumbent of Eastgate-in-Weardale.

*Small 8vo. 2s.*

*The Missioner's Hymnal.*

Edited by the Rev. A. G. Jackson, Warden of the Farm School, Redhill, Surrey.

*Royal 32mo. Sewed, 1d.; cloth boards, 3d.*

*With Music, Small 4to. 2s. 6d.*

*The Annotated Book of Common Prayer.*

Being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England.

Edited by the Rev. John Henry Blunt, D.D., Author of "The History of the Reformation," "The Annotated Bible," etc., etc.

*Revised and Enlarged Edition. 4to. £1 1s.;*

*or, Half-bound in Morocco, £1 11s. 6d.*

*Short Family Prayers.*

By the Rev. Peile Thompson, M.A.

*Crown 8vo. 2s.*

## *The School of Life.*

Seven Addresses delivered during the London Mission, in St. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, to Public School Men.

By late and present Head Masters.

With an Introduction by C. J. Vaughan, D.D., Dean of Llandaff, and Master of the Temple ; formerly Head Master of Harrow School.

*Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *Daily Prayers for Younger Boys.*

By the Rev. William Baker, D.D., Head Master of Merchant Taylors' School, and Prebendary of St. Paul's.

*Second Edition. Demy 32mo. 8d.*

## *Characteristics and Motives of the*

Christian Life. Ten Sermons preached in Manchester Cathedral in Lent and Advent, 1877.

By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester, and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

*Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *The Annotated Bible.*

Being a Household Commentary upon the Holy Scriptures, comprehending the Results of Modern Discovery and Criticism.

By John Henry Blunt, D.D., F.S.A., Editor of "The Annotated Book of Common Prayer," etc.

*Three Vols. With Maps, etc. Demy 4to. Sold separately.*

Vol. I. (668 pages.) Containing the GENERAL INTRODUCTION, with Text and Annotations on the Books from GENESIS to ESTHER. 31s. 6d.

Vol. II. (720 pages.) Completing the OLD TESTAMENT and APOCRYPHA. 31s. 6d.

Vol. III. (826 pages.) Containing the NEW TESTAMENT and GENERAL INDEX. 21s.

## *Weariness.*

A Book for the Languid and Lonely.

By H. L. Sidney Lear, Editor of "For Days and Years," "Christian Biographies," etc.

*Large Type. Fourth Edition. Small 8vo. 5s.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.



.....

## *The Witness of the Passion of our Most*

Holy Redeemer.

By the Rev. W. J. Knox Little, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Worcester,  
and Vicar of Hoar Cross.

*Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d.*

## *Here and Hereafter.*

Thoughts and Suggestions.

By E. C. R. With a Preface by the Lord Bishop of Lincoln.

*Second Edition. Small 8vo. 1s. 6d.*

## *The Confessions of S. Augustine.*

In Ten Books.

Translated and Edited by the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A., Rector  
of Kirkby Misperton, Yorkshire.

*Cheap Edition. 16mo. 2s. 6d.*

*Also with red borders. Small 8vo. 5s.*

## *The Life of Justification.*

A Series of Lectures delivered in Substance at All Saints', Margaret Street.

By the Rev. George Body, M.A., Canon of Durham.

*Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *The Life of Temptation.*

A Course of Lectures delivered in Substance at S. Peter's, Eaton Square;  
also at All Saints', Margaret Street.

By the Rev. George Body, M.A., Canon of Durham.

*Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d.*

## *Household Theology: a Handbook of*

Religious Information respecting the Holy Bible, the Prayer-book, the  
Church, the Ministry, Divine Worship, the Creeds, etc., etc.

By the Rev. John Henry Blunt, D.D., Editor of "The Annotated Book  
of Common Prayer," etc., etc.

*New and Cheaper Edition, 16mo., 1s.*

*The Larger Edition may still be had, 3s. 6d.*

## *Oxford House Papers: A Series of*

Papers for Working Men, written by Members of the University of Oxford.

*Those with numbers affixed are published. Nos. 1 to 8, 10 to 16, price 3d. each; or Cheap Edition, 1s. per dozen. No. 9, price 6d.; or Cheap Edition, 2s. per dozen.*

1. DIFFICULTIES ABOUT CHRISTIANITY NO REASON FOR DISBELIEVING IT. E. S. Talbot, M.A., Warden of Keble College, Oxford.
  2. EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT. F. Paget, D.D., Canon of Christ Church.
  3. THE NATIONAL CHURCH OF A DEMOCRATIC STATE. Spencer L. Holland, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
  4. WHY DO WE CALL THE BIBLE INSPIRED? W. Lock, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
  5. SALVATION. V. S. S. Coles, M.A., Librarian of the Pusey House.
  6. MAGNA CARTA—THE CHURCH AND ENGLISH FREEDOM. A. Hassall, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Oxford.
  7. FRATERNITY. G. W. Gent, M.A., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford.
  8. CAN MAN KNOW GOD? T. B. Strong, B.A., Lecturer of Christ Church, Oxford.
  9. FREE-THINKING. A brief Review of Mrs. Besant on the Evidences of Christianity. W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, and Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. 6d.; or Cheap Edition, 2s. per dozen.
  10. THE DISCIPLINE OF SELF. R. L. Ottley, M.A., Student of Christ Church.
  11. WHAT THE FIRST CHRISTIANS THOUGHT ABOUT CHRIST. W. Sanday, M.A., D.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, and Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.
  12. CHRIST AND MORALITY. A. Chandler, M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford.
  13. WHAT HAS CHRISTIANITY DONE FOR ENGLAND? H. O. Wakeman, M.A., Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford.
  14. JESUS CHRIST TO-DAY. J. G. Adderley, B.A., Christ Church, Oxford.
  15. PRAYER AND THE REIGN OF LAW. C. Gore, M.A., Principal Librarian of the Pusey House, and Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
  16. THE JUSTICE OF THE ATONEMENT. A. T. Lyttelton, M.A., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.
- CHRISTIANITY AND EVOLUTION. A. L. Moore, M.A., Tutor of Keble College, Oxford.
- PURITY. Henry Scott Holland, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's.

*'In One Volume. First Series. Nos. i.—xiii. Cloth, 2s. 6d.*

---

3, WATERLOO PLACE, LONDON.

